

THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the REV. S. C. CARPENTER, B.D., MASTER OF THE TEMPLE, o/o S.P.C.K.
HOUSE, NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, LONDON, W.C. 2, to whom MSS.
should be sent.

Vol. XXVIII

FEBRUARY, 1934

No. 164

EDITORIAL

THE union of the two English Catholic Societies is now an accomplished fact, though naturally a good deal remains to be done in the way of framing a lasting constitution. What has really happened? Has the lion swallowed the lamb, or the lamb swallowed the lion? Or has there been no swallowing, but only a lying down together, to rise up again a leagnus, terrible with banners? And anyhow, which is the lion and which the lamb? We do not know any of the inner history of the negotiations for union, but it is evident from the published report that some apprehension but practically no opposition was expressed, and that the work of unification was undertaken and carried through in a "sober, peaceable and truly conscientious" spirit. The special hopes which it seems right that THEOLOGY should entertain at this juncture are (1) that the evangelistic work for which the A.C.C. have done so much will go forward, moved by a humble desire for the glory of God; (2) that the work of the E.C.U. Literature Committee, which has already produced the *New Commentary*, *Liturgy and Worship*, *Elements of the Spiritual Life*, *Northern Catholicism*, and *The Counter-Reformation*, will continue and increase, that so religion and learning may go ever hand in hand; (3) that all things may be ordered with such wisdom and such charity that all Catholic churchmen may be thoroughly united, that the spirit of harmony may rule throughout the Anglican Communion, and in the end the wounds of a divided Christendom be healed. "Give these, and then Thy will be done."

In certain quarters doubts have been expressed about some of the A.C.C. publications. There are theologians to whom they seem temerarious, and though patient, it may be, of an Anglican interpretation, yet not ambitious of it. The reply is,

perhaps, that in a forward movement rash things are likely to be said, but that nevertheless forward is the right direction in which to go. The headlong methods of the men of Cyprus and Cyrene (Acts xi. 20) were doubtless surprising to the Blessed Apostle Peter, who within the New Testament period, at any rate, may without controversy be taken as the Catholic norm, and the language used by them may have been in some respects ill-advised. But the *fait accompli* which those young hotheads presented to the Church was a first-fruits of the Spirit. It has to be remembered that the Son of Exhortation, a man full of faith and of the Holy Ghost, investigated the new situation and reported that all was well. At the same time it is quite possible that he gave some sensible advice to the men of Cyprus and Cyrene. Our hope is that if there has been extravagance, or anything really inconsistent with the *ethos* of, say, the Lambeth Conference, it will not in its new company thrive as theological extravagance, or as exotic cosmopolitanism, but only as extravagant energy for the work of converting Englishmen to Christ, or as an emphatic reminder of the littleness of insularity.

An admirable specimen of A.C.C. literature is the *Report of the Oxford Movement Centenary Congress*, edited by Gabriel Gillett (Catholic Literature Association). A defiant note is struck here and there, but there is a complete absence of windy rhetoric, and much sober thankfulness and humble determination. The motto in a sense is "Lest we forget," but it is even better than that. It reminded us of a penetrating sermon once preached by Canon Simpson, then newly come to St. Paul's, at Southwark Cathedral. It was the Festival Service of the South London Church Fund, and we had all come from our slum parishes with our choirs, feeling happy and excited, to a great service at the Cathedral. And the preacher's text was, "And when He drew nigh, He saw the city and wept over it." His theme was the work which still needed to be done.

Here are a few extracts chosen almost at random from the volume:

"How magnificent it was—that choice of Wesley, that entire devotion and that heroic life! I doubt whether in the pages of Church history there are many cases equally splendid, equally devoted and triumphant. The graces of God to him were very rich, and he made rich use of them. They were based very largely upon Church discipline, the Church sacraments, and it was the Church fasting, which he kept up quite regularly, which steeled him for all the trials he went through. It was his weekly Communion that carried him through all the hostilities. As a sound son of the Church he went through all these things heroically and magnificently" (The Bishop of Truro).

"Keble uttered afresh (as it had hardly been uttered since 1714) the claim of the Church of England, that poor creature and *protégé* of the State, to a heavenly origin and a divine prerogative" (Professor Sir Raymond Beazley).

"They began the Movement not in order to make the English Church Catholic, but because they were convinced that it already was Catholic" (Professor N. P. Williams).

"Perfect beauty rests upon sound theology; and though a Catholic must admit that beauty of an intense kind exists apart from the Christian faith, still, even the intensest form of it, if divorced from a spiritual concept of the universe, is lacking in an element which, for him, is indispensable to perfection—*viz.*, permanence, or, if you will, transcendency" (Professor C. B. Tinker, of Yale, U.S.A.).

"I speak what I believe to be the mind not only of this great meeting, but of the overwhelming majority of Catholics throughout the Anglican Communion, when I say that our feelings towards our fellow-churchmen, of whatever party, are feelings of love and good-will" (Rev. G. D. Rosenthal).

Here are three more:

"My fear is that we are in danger of losing sight of our true vocation, and of becoming content to be a self-contained and self-satisfied group, instead of making our contribution to the whole Anglican Communion, and so to the Catholic Church. In any case, the cultivation of the tender grace of contrition will turn our attention more and more from our own desires, aims and concerns, and direct it to the call of our Lord and the grave needs of his Body" (The Bishop of Colombo).

"As a first instalment of our purpose and to prove its reality, shall we, here in the Albert Hall, declare war on the slums?" (Mr. J. G. Lockhart).

"Nor do we forget, thinking in requiem of such as John Henry Newman, that he and his oldest friends and we are now one, in one communion and fellowship. Blessed requiem, that scatters all the shadows in those struggles of the past!" (Rev. E. Milner-White).

There is one more point that must be faced. It has occasionally been suggested that Anglo-Catholic Congresses put forward their more moderate and acceptable speakers on the platform, concealing beneath the velvet glove of liberal learning the iron hand of something else. Thus the simple clergyman, and (in these matters) the even more simple layman, is lured into the movement. What of this? That a society in organizing a public meeting should aim at a strong platform is mere common sense, and we propose not to believe that there is anything sinister in the procedure. All education goes from point to point. Advanced teaching is not given in the junior school. Yet propaganda is dangerous work. Veracity is one of the greatest of the virtues. The temptation to sin against it in the supposed interests of a good cause is a very real temptation. We have all felt it. It is the peculiar trial of the eager ecclesiastic. But the sin is a sin against the Holy Ghost. "Grieve

not the Spirit." Let us all have a clear conscience in this matter. That we ourselves are unworthy to evangelize we know, but let our intention at least be worthy of our Lord.

We draw the attention of our readers to an illuminating paper read in December to the Alcuin Club by the Dean of Chichester. It is printed in the current number of *The English Catholic* (The Cherwell Press, St. Clement's Street, Oxford). This periodical is the quarterly gazette of the Anglican Society (Secretary, the Rev. W. E. Norris, Hemsworth Rectory, near Pontefract, Yorks), and deserves to be better known than it is. The Dean has some cogent reasons for believing that in the matter of liturgical precepts "the mind of the Church of England," as Dr. Goudge has said, "is at the present time more certainly known than it has been for hundreds of years." The main subject of the paper is the degree of authority which may rightly be assigned to the Revised Prayer Book. Speaking as one who listened to all the debates in the Assembly, he stoutly denies that there was any "truckling to Parliament" in the preparation of the Book, or indeed after its first rejection. When the need arose, the Bishops assumed the duty of giving a spiritual lead in liturgical affairs, as a thing inherent in their office ("An attitude which would have rejoiced the heart of Mr. Keble and Dr. Pusey. Newman could no longer have said, 'We relied on the Bishops, and they betrayed us.' It was a lead that had been accepted by synods of the clergy all over the country"), and it may justly be said that the Book has behind it the authority of the Church. In one point only does the Dean seem to leave a ragged edge. He deprecates a suggestion made in the Press that "the liturgical mind must be studied, not merely in the formal enactments of the Book of Common Prayer, but also in the vague region of modifications sanctioned by customary use." This has in his eyes "an uncomfortable suggestion of a *jus liturgicum* exercised by the parish priest." On the other hand, he says, "No one would wish to curb spontaneity, or quench the ground (growth?) of a true liturgical creativeness that seems to be springing up amongst us." Now here is the crux. How can we do justice at once to the law and to a proper freedom? Archbishop Tait summed up the Essays and Reviews controversy by saying, "The great evil is that the liberals are deficient in religion, and the religious in liberality." The present controversy is in a wholly different region, but it is as true now as it was then that the elevation of the house built on the frontage $a+b$ will be a^2+b^2+2ab —that is to say, a much more catholic structure than either a or b could edify alone.

The Bishop of Durham has published a second edition of his Charge on the Group Movement, to which he has added a long Preface, even more severely critical than the Charge itself. In March, 1933, he had said: "The Groupists, with their requirement of complete surrender and their open witness to Christ, are emphasizing elements of Christianity which are truly fundamental." "If we are humble enough, and penitent enough, and wise enough to learn from them, they may assist us to gain these very things." At the same time his main conclusion was: "I do not think that the Groupist Movement can be brought into harmony with the Church of England." It is this conclusion which is reiterated in the Preface. There is some damaging evidence about the practice of adopting one uniform technique of soul-healing, the calamitous temptation to turn "Quiet Times" into campaign committees, the interpretation of guidance as dictatorship, and a general understanding of the Christian religion which seems inconsistent with churchmanship. This is the case for the prosecution, put with profound sincerity and consummate skill. On the other side there are certain extravagant eulogies. A really judicial verdict is not at this stage possible. It will be given by the voice of History. Nevertheless, there are principles of interpretation, terrifying but undeniable. Is it not true that the only divinely established and therefore permanent things in the world are the Family and the Church? These will never fail. All human institutions, including the Group Movement, must be prepared to say, "He must increase: I must decrease." Is it not reasonable to suggest that the Group Movement itself will not prove permanent, but that its merit will have been to have issued a challenge to us all and to have been the occasion of eliciting from the Church a truer expression of its God-given life and power?

The Bishop of Ely was a man of singular charm. He had his own inner life of "quick-eyed sanctity, and the dread depths of grace," and it issued in pastoral sympathy of the truest kind, unfailing courtesy and a nimble wit. Here is one instance of his verbal acuteness and of the use to which he put it: In the course of a debate in the Assembly some rather rasping things had been said. Towards the end of the discussion the Bishop of Ely gently remarked, "Some things have been said this afternoon of the kind which makes the speaker, when he thinks about it afterwards, wish that they had been said by someone else." Dr. White-Thomson will be remembered at Cambridge, that interesting but difficult element in a rural diocese, and in the villages, with deep affection.

The early death of E. J. Bicknell is a heavy loss to King's College, to the Church, to the cause of sacred learning, and, as our readers will know, to THEOLOGY. He had an intense belief in the glorious vocation of the Church of England; his exposition of the Articles will remain for a generation, and perhaps longer, the standard book, and his Commentary on the Epistles to the Thessalonians in the Westminster Series shewed to the world, what his friends and pupils knew, that he was a first-rate New Testament scholar. A sentence from his Preface to that volume is characteristic: "We must insist that no devotional interpretation of the Scriptures can be sound which flies in the face of true scholarship, and also that scholars must recognize that these books can only be rightly interpreted by those who share to some extent the life and interests of the religious community whose experience they reflect."

Dr. Alan Hugh McNeile was a devoted priest, a learned Biblical scholar, an untiring worker, and a master of simple, compelling teaching about prayer. The recollection of a friendship which began in the "Jesus Lane Sunday School" in 1899 and included a talk in his house at Dublin in Holy Week, 1928, when he was already stricken with crippling physical infirmity, brings back many happy and inspiring memories. He did a great work while he was at Cambridge, and an even greater work, though it lives only in the memory and conscience of others and there is of it no written record, for the spiritual life of the Church of Ireland.

H. V. S. Eck, Prebendary of St. Paul's, was a priest of the Tractarian school, who carried down into our day the Liddon tradition. Learned, devout, austere in his own way of life, he was the kindest of friends, with a wide charity that was based on a sure faith. Readers will remember a valuable paper from his pen in our December number.

As we are going to press, we learn that an end has come to the long life of the great Lord Halifax. At his passing Christian men rise to their feet and stand bare-headed to salute the warrior, and then fall on their knees to commend the faithful soul. Indomitable old man, fervent in spirit, serving the Lord, for two whole generations an eager labourer for Catholic Reunion, courteous and pitiful, pattern of faith unfeigned, of courage unbreakable, of simplicity unspotted by the world, *in pace requiescas!*

CIVILIZATION AND THE FAITH

IF one compares the religion of today with the religion of a century ago, one cannot fail to notice a remarkable change of social attitude shown by the increasing preoccupation of religious minds with economic and political problems. In the last century religion was generally regarded as a private matter for the individual conscience. It was concerned with the salvation of men's souls, and not with their economic relations or their social or political ideals. Today most people feel that religion must affect social life: that it is not enough to feel religious or even to be religious in private life so long as social and economic life as a whole is based on non-religious principles. In short, we feel that the province of Christianity is not a part of life, but the whole, and that what we need is a Christian civilization.

Now the social complacency of Victorian religion was largely due to the fact that men believed that their civilization *was* in its broad lines a Christian one. Even so unworldly a man as Dean Church, perhaps the best representative of nineteenth-century Anglicanism, accepted this as a fundamental principle. "It seems impossible," he writes, "to conceive three things more opposite at first sight to the Sermon of the Mount than War, Law and Trade; yet Christian society has long since made up its mind about them, and we all accept them as among the necessities or occupations of human society." "Christ has sanctified, He has in many ways transformed, that society which is only for this time and life; and while calling and guiding souls one by one to the Father, He has made His gracious influence felt where it could least be expected. Even war and riches, even the Babel life of our great cities, even the high places of ambition and earthly honour, have been touched by His spirit, have found how to be Christian."*

But we do not feel like this any longer. The war and the revolutionary challenge of Communism have killed this point of view. There is a general feeling today that the Victorian compromise was wrong—that war is unchristian, that business is unchristian, and that even the state is to a great extent unchristian also. We have lost both the optimism of the Victorian Liberals and the old Conservative acceptance of the state and the social hierarchy as a God-given order. We find it much easier to understand the attitude of the early Church, with its uncompromising hostility to the world and to the power of

* *The Gifts of Civilization*, pp. 44, 57.

Mammon. To the self-satisfied prosperous society of Victorian England that attitude was something of a stumbling-block; indeed, the late Dr. Abbott, in his book on *The Anglican Career of Cardinal Newman*, blames Newman severely for not having realized that this attitude was entirely out of date and was only relevant to the special circumstances of the Church in relation to the Roman Empire. Actually, however, this attitude is so deeply rooted in Christianity—in the Bible and the Fathers and the tradition of the Church—that Christianity would be an entirely different religion without it. The whole Christian tradition, and the prophetic tradition which lies behind it, are a standing protest against the injustice and falsehood of that which is commonly called civilization. The world, which is the natural enemy of the Church, is not a moral abstraction: it is an historical reality which finds its embodiment in the empires and world cities of history—in Babylon and Tyre and Rome. Wherever the City of Man sets itself up as an end in itself and becomes the centre of a self-contained and self-regarding order, it becomes the natural enemy of the City of God.

The Roman Empire was antichristian, not because of its official worship of Jupiter and Mars and the rest, but because it made its own power and greatness the supreme law and the only measure of its social action. Judged from this point of view, modern civilization is no less contrary to Christian principles than was that of antiquity. We have abolished idolatry and slavery, and some of the grosser forms of public immorality, but the essential idolatry—the worship of material power and wealth—is as strong as ever.

Never before in the history of the world has a civilization been so completely secularized, so confident in its own powers, and so sufficient to itself as is our own. The crude and aggressive atheism of the Soviet state is but the logical culmination of a tendency that has characterized the general development of European civilization for the last century and a half. Indeed, we may well ask if the toleration which is still shewn to Christianity by the states of Western Europe is not due to the fact that religion is regarded by them as something politically negligible, and, consequently, whether it is not really more insulting to Christianity than the open hostility of the Bolsheviki. We have to face the prospect of a growing pressure on individual thought and behaviour making for the complete secularization of social life. The state will be less tolerant of criticism and of differences of opinion in so far as they affect, not only politics, but social conduct of any kind. It aspires more and more to govern the life of the individual, to mould his thought by education and propaganda, and to make him the obedient

instrument of its will. The old individualist ideal of the state as a policeman whose business it is to clear the field for individual initiative is a thing of the past. The state of the future will be, not a policeman, but a nurse, and a schoolmaster, and an employer, and an officer—in short, an earthly providence, an all-powerful, omni-competent human god, and a very jealous god at that. We see one form of this ideal in Russia and another in Germany. It may be that we shall see yet a third in England and America. Personally I do not believe that the Western democracies will ever become either Communist or Fascist. But I think it is very probable that they will follow a parallel line of development and evolve a kind of democratic *étatisme* which, while being less arbitrary and inhumane than the other two forms of government, will make just as large a claim on the life of the individual as they do and will demand an equally whole-hearted spiritual allegiance. We can already discern the beginnings of this paternal-democratic régime in England and can see how all the apparatus of the social services—universal secondary education, birth control clinics, ante-natal clinics, welfare centres, and the rest—may become instruments of a collective despotism which destroys human liberty and spiritual initiative as effectively as any Communist or Nazi terrorism.

What should be the attitude of Christians towards this situation? Can we hope to reverse the present tendency of Western society and to restore a Christian civilization? Or must we withdraw from the world and resign ourselves to a subterranean persecuted existence like that of the early Christians?

This is a serious dilemma, for it is much easier to state the objections to either course than to find a solution. The history of our civilization is so bound up with Christian traditions and ideals that it seems wrong to acquiesce in the victory of secularism without a struggle. Yet, on the other hand, any attempt to associate Christianity with a definite programme of political or economic reform is fraught with difficulties and dangers. As we have seen, modern secularism is not a single united force; it appears in the modern world under three separate forms which are not only different from one another, but naturally antagonistic. Consequently it is no use attacking one of them, if the defeat of one merely leads to the victory of another. Religious people are not always very clear-sighted in political matters, and nothing is easier than for them to mistake the real danger and to waste their time attacking that form of secularism which happens to be the most unpopular in their own society, and consequently the least likely to succeed, while they close their eyes to the real source of danger. And thus we find Christian

Nationalists, like the *Deutsche Christen*, attacking Marxism as the embodiment of antichristian secularism, while they appear to be entirely oblivious of the dangers to spiritual freedom and to Christian moral ideals involved in the Nazi cult of the racial state. And in the same way we find Christian Socialists in this country who are determined to destroy Militarism and Capitalism and Nationalism as the enemies of the Kingdom of God, but who do not realize that Socialism itself is capable of becoming just as dangerous to spiritual freedom. It is easy for us to denounce the unchristian behaviour of the Nazis, because we have no temptation to behave as they do. Nobody supposes that the members of Y.M.C.A. or Toc H are likely to start hunting down pacifists or trying to beat up Lord Melchett or Mr. Lansbury. Our temptations are more subtle, but no less real. The danger to religion in this country, and perhaps also in the United States, is that we should substitute a gospel of humanitarianism and social reform for the gospel of Christ. No one can dispute the genuine value of the practical aims which such a programme sets out to accomplish—the destruction of slums, the abolition of poverty, the abolition of war, secondary education for all, higher pay for shorter hours, and so forth. Nevertheless, all these aims may be realized and yet civilization may be none the more Christian for all that. They could be realized just as completely in a purely secular order which entirely rejects every kind of religion—as, for example, in the proletarian order of Communism, in the capitalist Utopia of Mr. H. G. Wells, and even in the scientific nightmare of Mr. Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*.

This does not mean that Christians should not do all in their power to realize these aims. They must take their share, and more than their share, as good citizens; in the same way as in the Fascist state they must be more patriotic, not less patriotic, than the professed nationalist.

But, on the other hand, they must recognize that these ends are not either final or exclusive: that a programme of humanitarian social reform, however successful, will not suffice to conquer the forces of social evil, and that if it is based on false principles it may even prove to be their ally. Above all, we must remember that an exclusive and one-sided devotion to a particular object often ends by defeating the very end that it has in view. Just as German militarism ended in military defeat and the Russian Five Year Plan has produced a state of general scarcity not far removed from famine, so too an insistence on higher wages may help to increase unemployment, and a campaign for the abolition of poverty may end in the pauperization of a whole society. If once the forces of moral indignation are

enlisted on behalf of a particular political course, there is no saying what injustices and absurdities may not be perpetrated in the name of social justice.

It is the great danger of social idealism that it tends to confuse religious and political categories. The theologian says that it is better that the world should perish rather than that a single creature should commit a single act of mortal sin, and in the same way the social idealist feels that it is better for the state to perish than that a single poor man should want bread or that a single child should be brought up in squalor and ignorance. But whereas no theologian has ever attempted to destroy the world, there have been plenty of social idealists who have done their best to destroy the state. And if they succeed they find perfection is as far away as ever, and if they do not themselves fall victims to the forces they have unchained, they are forced laboriously to build up again the fabric that they have destroyed. The great art of the statesman is to recognize his limitations and to prefer the modest harvest of laborious practical reform to the golden fruit of the idealist's imagination.

I do not, of course, mean that the Christian is bound to support the existing social order and to rest satisfied with the world as it is. He realizes its evils even more than the secular idealist, and that is why he does not believe that any political or economic programme will be enough to put things right. Humanity labours under a burden of inherited evil which it is powerless of itself to throw off. In St. John's terrible phrase, "the whole world lies in the power of the evil one." By this he means, not the material world in the Manichæan sense, nor the temporal order of the state, as some of the more extreme Christian sects have held, but the world of man apart from God, the world of the human animal, the accumulated result of the forces of lust and fear and pride and self-interest that drive mankind down the bloody road of history. It is true that this is not the whole life of humanity. Man is a reasonable being, with a sense of spiritual things and a certain power of free choice. He can renounce the world, like Buddha, by a supreme act of spiritual will, and turn his face away from the tragedy of human existence towards the silence of eternity; or, if he is lucky, he can fence off a piece of ground from the wilderness and cultivate a garden of art or literature or science; or he can devote his powers to the service of society as a statesman or a soldier and bring order out of chaos, though, as with the founders of the Roman Empire or those of the Soviet Republic, this may involve incalculable suffering and bloodshed. What he cannot do is to change human life in essentials—to check what St. Augustine calls the torrent of human custom or to change the city of man into the

city of God. That is the illusion of the idealists, and it is a dangerous illusion because it gives a quasi-religious character to forces that in themselves are neither ideal nor spiritual. For example, national feeling or the economic interests of a particular class are of themselves formidable powers, but if they are raised to the spiritual plane, and as it were deified by the social idealism of Nationalism or Communism, they become monstrous idols which demand human sacrifices on a scale which far surpasses anything to be found in West Africa or ancient Mexico.

The Christian solution was a fundamentally different one from that of social idealism. And this was not simply due to the fact that the world of the first century A.D. was not yet ripe for idealism. On the contrary, it had to meet the rivalry of the social millennialism of the Jews, which was more intense, because it was more genuinely religious, than the social millennialism of modern Socialism; and, on the other hand, it had to meet the humanitarian idealism of Hellenism, which was even more rational and even more humane than any form of modern liberal idealism. Christianity refused each of these alternatives: it offered men the answer of the Cross—to the Jews a scandal and to the Greeks foolishness, just as today it is a scandal to the secular reformer and foolishness to the rational idealist. In the life of Christ the power of the world—the torrent of human custom—at last met with another power which it could neither overcome nor circumvent; the irresistible power met the immovable obstacle, and the result was the tragedy of the Cross, a tragedy which seemed at first sight to manifest the triumph of the forces of evil and the victory of the flesh over the spirit, but which was in reality the turning-point in the history of humanity and the starting-point of a new order.

Christianity literally called a new world into existence to redress the balance of the old. It did not attempt to reform the world, in the sense of the social idealist. It did not start an agitation for the abolition of slavery, or for peace with Parthia. It did not support the claims of the Jews to national self-determination, or the Stoic propaganda for an ideal world state. It left Cæsar on his throne and Pilate and Gallio on their judgment seats and went its own way to the new world.

To the ordinary educated man looking out in the world in A.D. 33 the execution of Sejanus must have appeared infinitely more important than the crucifixion of Jesus, and the attempts of the Government to solve the economic crisis by a policy of free credit to producers must have seemed far more promising than the doings of the obscure group of Jewish fanatics in an upper chamber at Jerusalem. Nevertheless there is no doubt today which was the more important and which availed more to alter

the lot of humanity. All that Roman world, with its power and wealth and culture and corruption, sank into blood and ruin—the flood came and destroyed them all; but the other world, the world of apostles and martyrs, the inheritance of the poor, survived the downfall of ancient civilization and became the spiritual foundation of a new order. Not that this new order was itself the new world to which Christianity had looked. Christendom is not Christianity. It is not the City of God and the Kingdom of Christ. It is simply the old world externally and formally submitted to that Kingdom. Humanity remains much the same as it has always been. To quote Newman: “The state of great cities now is not so very different from what it was of old; at least, not so different as to shew that the main work of Christianity has lain with the face of society, or what is called the world. Again, the highest class in the community and the lowest are not so different from what they would be respectively without the knowledge of the Gospel as to allow it to be said that Christianity has succeeded with the world as the world in its several ranks and classes. And so of its professions and pursuits. They are in character what they were, softened or restrained in their worst tendencies, but still with the same substantial fruits. Trade is still avaricious, not in tendency only, but in fact, though it has heard the Gospel. Lawyers, soldiers, farmers, politicians, courtiers—nay, shame to say, the priesthood—still savour of the old Adam. Christian states move forward upon the same laws as before, and sin and fall, as time goes on, on the same internal principles. Human nature remains what it was, though it has been baptized.”*

Newman was writing, of course, of Protestant England in the nineteenth century, but the same things may be said *mutatis mutandis* of the thirteenth century or of any other age. The mediæval knight was the barbarian warrior with a veneer of Christian chivalry, and the mediæval prelate was first cousin to the mediæval baron. This is what Dr. Coulton sees, and he is perfectly justified in his protest against the idealization of mediæval culture as the complete social expression of Christianity. Unfortunately he falls into just the same error himself when he begins to speak of the modern age as standing on a higher level, not merely of civilization, but of spiritual achievement.

In reality no age has the right to call itself Christian: all stand under the same condemnation. The one merit of a relatively Christian age or culture—and it is a no small one—is that it recognizes its spiritual indigence and stands open to God and the spiritual world; while the age or culture that is

* Newman, *Parochial Sermons*, vol. iv. x.

thoroughly non-Christian is closed to God and prides itself on its own progress to perfection. No doubt there is a real leaven of spiritual progress at work in mankind, and the life of the world to come is already stirring in the womb of the present. But the progress of the new world is an invisible one, and its results can only be fully seen at the end of time. Apparent success often means spiritual failure, and the way of failure and suffering is the royal road of Christian progress. Wherever the Church has seemed to dominate the world and achieves a victory within the secular sphere, she has had to pay for it in a double measure of temporal and spiritual misfortune. Thus the triumph of the Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire was followed first by the loss of the East to Islam and then by the schism with the West. The mediæval attempt to create a Christian theocracy was followed by the Reformation and the destruction of the religious unity of Western Europe, while the attempt that was made both by the Puritans and by the monarchies of the counter-Reformation to drag on society into orthodoxy and piety was followed by the incredulity and anti-clericalism of the eighteenth century and the secularization of European culture.

There is no longer any danger of Christians attempting to force their beliefs on others at the point of the sword or of their trying to make men religious by Act of Parliament. The danger today is rather that well-meaning people are apt to reduce Christianity to the level of secular idealism by identifying it with whatever social or political cause is most popular at the moment, whether it be National Socialism in Germany or humanitarian Socialism in England. In a sense it is quite true to say that all our troubles are due to the neglect of Christian teaching, and that Christianity is the remedy for social as well as our individual evils. But it is not like a patent medicine that is warranted to cure all diseases. It offers no short cuts to economic prosperity or social stability. A century ago there was a tendency to treat Christianity as a kind of social sedative that kept the lower classes obedient and industrious, and the consequence of this was the Marxian denunciation of religion as the opium of the poor. And if today we treat Christianity as a social tonic that will cure economic depression and social unrest and make everybody happy, we shall only ensure future disillusionment and reaction. It is impossible to create a Christian social order *ab extra* by the application of a few ready-made principles or by introducing legislative reforms. And even if it were possible, it would be of little profit to get the world to accept Christian economic principles when it does not accept Christian intellectual and moral principles. The well-meaning people who talk about the

possibility or the necessity of a Christian revolution or of a Christian social order do not consider where the Christians are to come from who are to carry out the former or to administer the latter. We know how hard it is for practising Catholics to apply their religion to social life, and even if the Christian social order was capable of exact political and economic definition, one may well feel dubious as to what it would become in the hands of the politicians and economists who would have the responsibility of carrying it out in practice. It is notorious that ecclesiastics often make the most unscrupulous politicians, as we see in the case of Wolsey, Richelieu, Mazarin and Alberoni; and in the same way the political parties which adopt religious programmes and claim to represent the cause of God, like the thirteenth-century Guelfs, the Holy League in the sixteenth century, and the Covenanters and Puritans in the seventeenth, have always distinguished themselves by their fanaticism and violence—in fact, by a general lack of all the political virtues. Political religion is an offence alike to religion and to politics: it takes from Caesar what belongs to him of right and fills the temple with the noise and dust of the market-place. The only really and specifically Christian politics are the politics of the world to come, and they transform social life, not by competing with secular politics on their own ground, but by altering the focus of human thought and opening the closed house of secular culture to the free light and air of a larger and a more real world.

Far be it from me to suggest that religion ought to be segregated from practical life, and that self-interest and the acquisitive instinct are to be given free play. There is all the difference in the world between the religious distinction between the sacred and the profane or the spiritual and the temporal and the modern secularist opposition between religion as the sphere of subjective emotion and business and politics as the world of objective reality. On the contrary, religion is the sphere of the absolute, while business and politics belong to the sphere of the relative. Religion is the fixed pole on which human life revolves and to which all its parts must be related. Even pagan society has recognized this, as we see in its constant effort to consecrate the social order and the work by which men live to the divine powers which rule the world. Perhaps the most striking example of this is the great annual ceremony of the Sacrifice to Heaven by which the Emperor of China, as it were, co-ordinated the social order with the Way of Heaven, and we see the same idea everywhere in the elaborate codes of ritual and religious law by which the archaic cultures regulated their existences. In spite of the oppression and cruelty that marked the ancient state and of the impotence of man to control the evil forces that

manifested themselves in social life, men always felt that civilization did not merely exist to serve men's needs and desires, but that it ought to be a *sacred order* which conformed social action to the divine and eternal law. When a civilization has entirely abandoned this belief, when it makes itself its own law and its own end and cuts itself off from its roots in the spiritual order, then its days are numbered. It is doomed to destruction, not by any external fatality, but by the decay of its own energies and the loss of its social vitality. That is the fate that threatens Western culture today. It has been temporarily sustained by the stimulus it has derived from forms of social idealism like Liberalism, Nationalism and Socialism, which are really substitute religions and owe their appeal largely to habits of thought and conduct that have been generated by ages of religious faith. They are, in fact, intermediate phenomena which belong to the transition stage through which a culture passes when it is ceasing to be religious and before it is completely secularized. But in so far as these social faiths themselves forward the complete secularization of culture, they are digging their own graves and that of the civilization which they dominate. As the religious element passes out of them with the growing secularization of culture they lose their power over men's minds and descend to the level of practical politics, as, for instance, Continental Liberalism has done during the last generation. And as the vision fades, society is left to itself with no faith or hope to sustain it, and man is brought once again face to face with the vanity of human existence and the worthlessness of human achievement. *Acceperunt mercedem suam, vani vanam.*

If this is so, it is clear that the true social function of religion is not to busy itself with economic or political reforms, but to save civilization from itself by revealing to men the true end of life and the true nature of reality. In other words, religion must be religious. That is the *unum necessarium*. If Christianity can generate a truly religious faith, it can transform culture; if not, it is powerless to help the world. Unfortunately the children of this world are not only wiser, but also more spiritually active than the children of light. We are faced with the disturbing spectacle of Communists who preach the dismal gospel of Marxism with an enthusiasm and devotion which is rare among Christians, and of unbelievers who conduct a more intelligent propaganda on behalf of materialism and destruction than do believers on behalf of spiritual truth and life. Faith and intelligence are the two strongest forces in the world, and when they are united nothing can stand against them; but so long as they are separated and the truths of religion are left unused on the top shelf of our intellectual cupboards, progress is impossible.

If Christians are to do their duty towards society and civilization they must act, and of all forms of action by far the strongest and the most efficacious is the act of thought.

CHRISTOPHER DAWSON.

THE CHRISTIAN FAITH AND MODERN SCEPTICISM

It is well to begin with some definition of terms. Scepticism is a word with various shades of meaning. It may imply definite and even fanatical unbelief, or it may imply uncertainty and doubt of a greater or less intensity. Again, scepticism may be predominantly intellectual in character, or it may be of a "moral" or "practical" kind, expressing itself, without reflection or articulation, in everyday conduct and behaviour. In what follows, attention will be mainly directed to this latter variety of scepticism, which I take to be the type most prevalent in this country: that inarticulate and unexamined uncertainty and doubtfulness, in regard to religion and morals, which constitutes the psychological atmosphere we live in.

This necessary delimitation of the topic must be my apology for saying little about what may be described as self-conscious and more or less clearly-defined secularism. Ours—the reader may have heard it before!—is a secular civilization. Its philosophy, so far as it has one, is some form or other of Humanism: Humanism, it need hardly be said, in a new sense of that great word, not in the sense in which it can be applied to the great Christian figures of the Renaissance—Colet and Erasmus and Sir Thomas More and many others. To these men "nothing human was alien"; but their Humanism was, nevertheless, theocentric. God and the eternal world were the background of all their hopes and dreams for man. To our contemporary Humanists, on the other hand, God is dead, and the task of the moral philosopher is to restore *man* to the dignity he has lost with the loss of his belief in God. For the Humanists are as aware as anyone else of a very significant fact: that civilization's abandonment of the idea of man as an essentially supernatural being, with his roots and his "end" in the eternal world, has resulted, not in increasing, but in belittling the significance of man. To make man the measure of all things is to reduce him in the end to the level of the smallest and most unimportant things. "Man without God," as M. Berdiaev remarks, "ceases to be man." The Humanist ideal, then, is to restore man to his lost dignity:

and to do this without recourse to belief in God or in any moral or spiritual values which are not the creation of the human spirit itself. The attempt takes various forms. They will be familiar to many readers: the bombastic stoicism of Lord Russell; the unashamed hedonism of Mr. Clive Bell and Mr. J. C. Powys (from both of whom, nevertheless, I think we have something to learn); Mr. Julian Huxley's "Religion of Humanity"—the selfless concern for "the community and the race," "the enrichment of life" as man's "first and greatest aim"; on a lower intellectual level, Mr. H. G. Wells's notion of an oligarchy of intellectuals ordering the rest of humanity about; the late Prof. Irving Babbitt's "spiritual positivism"—the cultivation of the "inner check"—on which Mr. T. S. Eliot has commented: "Boil down Horace, the Elgin Marbles, St. Francis and Goethe, and the result will be a pretty thin soup"; finally, Mr. Walter Lippmann's emphasis on "maturity" and "disinterestedness," sustained by the pathetic faith that men will be "driven to" this "high religion" (as he calls it) when once they see "just how and in what sense the ideal of disinterestedness is inherent and inevitable in the modern world."

The following quotation from a book by an American writer, Prof. Max Otto, may be taken to represent the common features of contemporary Humanism:

"It is thus a constructive social suggestion that we endeavour to give up, as the basis of our desire to win a satisfactory life, the quest for companionship with a being behind or within the fleeting aspect of nature; that we assume the universe to be indifferent towards the human venture that means everything to us; that we acknowledge ourselves to be adrift in infinite space on our little earth, the sole custodians of our ideals . . . that we may then, with new zest . . . turn from the recognition of our cosmic isolation to a new sense of human togetherness, and so discover in a growing human solidarity, in a progressively ennobled humanity, in an increasing joy in living, the goal we have all along blindly sought, and build on earth the fair city we have looked for in a compensatory world beyond."

It is impossible here to do more than call attention to one or two of the more obvious criticisms of this general philosophy of life: its over-intellectualism and arrogance; its naïve assumption (contradicted by the whole of experience) that education and intellectual enlightenment form a satisfactory substitute for the forces of religion—that the clever are always the good; its total failure to appreciate what the "nerve" of religion really is, or to face up to the claims of Christian Theism as a coherent philosophical system; most important of all, its pathetic belief (to which I have alluded) that a moral code is its own dynamic. St. Paul knew better: "The good that I would, I do not; the evil

that I would not, that I do. Who shall deliver me, who cannot deliver myself?" On this point I do not think we can add anything to the judgment of Mr. Lawrence Hyde: "Man cannot in the end draw his inspiration from contemplating the material ends which he is seeking to realize. The basis of effective activity on the material plane is an internal anchorage to something within, which is raised above the level of the fluctuating and the fugitive." Finally, a deeply significant *dictum* by the recognized leader of American Humanists, the late Prof. Irving Babbitt, may be quoted: "The problem of the Humanist is to discover some equivalent for grace."

This is a totally inadequate treatment of what I have called self-conscious scepticism; but for my present purpose it must suffice. More important, as I have suggested, is the vast mass of "moral" scepticism and uncertainty which forms the psychological background of our lives. There can be little question, surely, that the dominant mood of our time is one of disillusionment, impotence and despair. Intellectually, we are aware that civilization stands upon—if it has not already passed—the threshold of a New Age: the Age of Power, of Plenty, of Leisure, of Opportunity. Yet few people are exhilarated at the prospect. Why not? Chiefly because we have ceased to believe in Providence. We have ceased to believe that the infinite complexities of modern human relationships—personal, economic, international—are amenable to the control of the forces with which religion is concerned: the forces, namely, of God, and of human wills striving to learn and co-operate with the will of God. Instead, we talk of "world events," "world causes," "natural laws." The current talk—even more common on the Continent than here—about the "inevitability" of war in the near future is an example of the sense of impotence referred to. Other examples abound. Mr. Montagu Norman has protested, in a (rightly) much-quoted speech, that the world situation is beyond his comprehension; he cannot foretell, much less direct, the inevitable and relentless march of "events"; "one step enough" for him. The Prime Minister has warned us that, if and when the present depression passes, we must in this country resign ourselves to the existence of a permanent army of at least a million unemployed. The most paradoxical feature of the world today is by now familiar to all: the fact that, while millions are starving, vast sums of money are being spent on the destruction of food. Yet no one, save a few intellectuals whom we are happily content to dismiss as "currency cranks," dares to question the sanity of the assumption that direct or indirect concern with the *process* of production constitutes a man's only claim to share in its *fruits*. It is beyond

the ordinary man's imagination that, even in a world teeming with plenty, anyone should have something for nothing, or should eat unless he works—though society does not need his work. Most of us continue to acquiesce in the division of the community into two classes: those who need neither work nor starve, and those who *must* work or starve. Is it any wonder that the unemployed—the more reflective among them, at least—are asking themselves whether they are, indeed, anything more than what we allow ourselves to call them—a “problem,” *the Problem*? In a society in which, on the ordinary assumptions, vast numbers must be condemned to life at or near the starvation level, it would seem that, from the point of view of the community, the best thing an unemployed man with a family dependent on him can do is to cut his own and their throats. There seems no escape from this conclusion, so long as it is taken for granted that we are in the grip of impersonal and unalterable “causes” and “forces”: “but helpless pieces in the game” played, not by Khayyám's unheeding Allah, and not by the wickedness of men, but by the relentless march of “events.” Now and then one of the victims of a social order which has ceased to be an order *acts* on the theory which nine-tenths of the discussion of the present *impasse* suggests to him as the true one. Then we (through our coroners) pronounce that he, and not society itself, is “of unsound mind.”

Now let us glance at the reasons for this banishment of the thought of the overruling providence of God from the mind of the modern world.

Little will be said here about the alleged discrepancy between religion and science; the importance of this factor in the situation is probably very greatly exaggerated. No doubt there is a vague, widespread impression among the uneducated that the “Higher Criticism” has proved the Bible to be untrue; that recent physics has upset the Christian doctrines of creation and of the cosmic significance of man; that “modern psychology” has proved all religious beliefs to be “wish-fulfilments,” and man's freedom a delusion; and that the comparative study of religions has shown that what were hitherto supposed to be peculiarly Christian doctrines were common form in the Mediterranean world two thousand years ago. Obviously these charges cannot be discussed in a single article. But it may be worth pointing out that the insistence and confidence with which they are made commonly vary in inverse proportion to the real knowledge of the people who make them: knowledge, that is, both of the expert scientific opinion being quoted, *and* of the particular bit of the Christian faith which is supposed to be at stake. If Christianity were what some of its critics suppose it to be, no

doubt we ought all to be agnostics. But of course it isn't. But two considerations suggest themselves. In the first place, it is really a reflection on Christians themselves that the arguments for Christianity commonly shattered in anti-Christian books are such negligible ones. It is a depressing thought that the only types of Christian faith which an obviously fair-minded critic like Mr. Walter Lippmann has come across should be types which most of us would hardly recognize as Christian at all; he seems to have met nothing between the crudest and most incredible Fundamentalism and a Modernism so extreme as to be barely distinguishable from "reformed" Judaism or a tenuous Unitarianism. This may remind us of one of the principal troubles of the Church today, which is, as the Dean of Exeter has said somewhere, that though there is a strong case to be made out for Christianity, it is not the case which most Christians imagine it to be. We most of us need to be far more adequately equipped than we commonly are to give, not just any reason, but *the best* reason for the hope that is in us.

The other consideration is this: It is a mistake to suppose that anyone can be argued into accepting Christianity. God is more than an object of thought. He is primarily the Source of Experience; and faith, while not contrary to reason, is more than reason. To imagine that you can convince a man of the truth of Christianity unless he is prepared *at the same time* to put himself in a position in which God can communicate with him—in a word, to begin to say his prayers—is like imagining that you can teach him to swim without putting him into the water.

But other factors, as I have suggested, are more important, for an understanding of the contemporary situation, than these self-conscious "intellectual difficulties." The fundamental fact—and the fundamental evil—is that modern civilization has grown up, and is developing, with little or no notion either of the relative importance of society's various activities—economic, cultural, spiritual—or of their relationship to one another. The abandonment of the doctrine of man's supernatural "end" and status—which was the central and controlling doctrine of mediæval Christendom, however wide the gulf between the ideal itself and men's attainment of it—has usually one of two results. Each particular human concern is now apt *either* to claim, not merely autonomy for itself, but control over the whole of life; *or* to withdraw from contact with the rest of life altogether. The former of these consequences may be illustrated in the economic sphere, where "Business is business" means, in effect, "Life is business, and the whole life of man ought to be subordinated to the claims and necessities of business"; the second, in the condition of contemporary art. "There is

no doubt," says Mr. Herbert Read (*Art Now*), "that the modern artist, feeling himself no longer in any vital contact with society, performing no necessary or positive function in the life of the community, retreats upon himself, and gives expression to his own states of subjectivity, limiting himself to this expression, and not caring whether such expression is also communication" or not; hence our Abstractionists and *Surréalistes* and the rest.

In psychological language, the modern man, and modern society, has no controlling, dominant sentiment. In ethical matters, for example, thought and speech are now so unfettered that, while some of us have made toleration our god—with the implication that any opinion is just as "good" as its antithesis—others have lost the ability to recognize a poisonous moral opinion when they come across one in a book or play or film. The kaleidoscope of current history passes before us with such rapidity that we do not appreciate its significance. Nothing happens anywhere on the earth's surface without our being aware of it within the hour. We hear so much that we can listen to nothing. The miseries and the catastrophes and the wickednesses we read of in our *Times* are forgotten by the time we get our *Evening Standard*. The result is a widespread moral apathy and indifference which is certainly one of the most serious features of the time. Could Wilberforce have roused *our* generation to the iniquity of slavery? Would Gladstone have moved *us* to righteous indignation at the Bulgarian atrocities? Even if the prophet we so desperately need were forthcoming, could he even secure our attention for more than a day or two, while he uttered his *Thus saith the Lord* about the Assyrian massacres, or the treatment of the Jews in Germany, or *The Naked Truth* about the slums, or what a recent book truly describes as *The Bloody Traffic* in armaments? We mean well, no doubt. But our good intentions are so dissipated that we cannot *concentrate* on any one objective, universally agreed to be desirable, and say: This we will have; or on any one recognized evil, and say that it shall cease to be.

The reason for the modern man's lack of discrimination and proportion—for his failure to *select* in moral and spiritual as well as in less important things—is not far to seek. It is because his life has no centre, no *focus*: in religious language, no object of *worship*. He is living from hand to mouth. "We are confronted," says Mr. Lawrence Hyde, "with the spectacle of a race of beings who are everywhere at once and at no place in particular. The individual is hardly ever able to behave with real deliberation. He is not acting because he knows, deep within his being, that this is what he must do at this particular juncture. He is not acting because he has discovered, by

resolute introspection, that he will violate himself if he behaves otherwise. He is not, in any profound way, identified with his deeds. He acts usually because, after balancing things up, this or that seems to be what is left—what appears, after all, to be the best thing to do. He looks *outwards* upon the concrete possibilities before him; not *inwards*, in order to discover the direction in which the deeper life is flowing within the soul."

Most people would agree that Communism is a religion. And what makes Communism a religion? It is the fact—and we shall not begin to understand the attraction of Communism for a large (and perhaps increasing) number of intelligent people until we realize it—that it appears to present men with an object of worship: an "end" beyond and outside themselves, which they can regard themselves as serving: an Absolute, in relation to which they can judge the value and worthwhileness of all human activities—their own and other people's: in psychological language, a master-sentiment which can integrate and unify all their otherwise conflicting impulses and desires.

(In Russia) "man is being submerged in a gigantic concrete enterprise, to achieve which all political and human problems become questions of ways and means. We cannot preach duty to a God we no longer believe in; but in Russia they have set up a new god, earthly and credible, before whom they bow down in genuine devotion."*

There, then, is integration of a sort. But it is attained at the price of denying any worth or significance whatever to individual personality as such. Other objectives, as we know, may act as unifying influences: a single, clearly-defined ambition, an absorbing hobby or profession, a passion for knowledge or for mastery of some particular subject, a personal relationship. It is the conviction of the Christian that only one relationship—that with God Himself, initiated by God, and sustained throughout its course by God, in response to faith—is capable of producing complete interior and exterior harmony and peace. What men need, and what society needs, is the domination of the Christ-sentiment, grounded and kept in being by the attitude of worship.

What, then, are the elements in the Christian Faith most relevant to the contemporary situation? What are the doctrines which we most need to stress, and to understand, over against modern scepticism? They are the doctrines of Creation and Redemption. This statement may be shortly expanded.

It is involved in the doctrine of Creation that the nature and the destiny of man are known. He is made "in the image of God," who is Love. Fellowship, therefore (sociality), is a

* Geoffrey Sainsbury: *The Dictatorship of Things*. I cannot believe, with an eminent reviewer in *The Criterion*, that this book is a "leg-pull."

datum, involved in the Divine constitution of things, not a thing to be created by man. Man is not—as Spengler, among others, would have us believe—in his essential being a predatory wild beast: he is (as modern anthropology abundantly testifies) a social animal. God made man to be “the image of His own eternity”—i.e., to share and to manifest His own life, the characteristic principle of which is self-giving, redemptive love. Had it not been for the Fall, human society would have incarnated and expressed, ever more truly and more adequately, by the quality of human lives, the nature of the Godhead itself. For the Fall, be it noted, was a declension, not from primitive perfection, but from primitive innocence and perfectibility: man’s Great Refusal, at some infinitely remote period in human history, to follow the upward path divinely marked out for him, and recognized (however unreflectively) as the path of his true development. Man at his first appearance on the earth was such that, if he had not sinned, the world would have come to be a real community. Redemption, then, means the recovery of possibilities forfeited by sin: the restoration of man to his original status and potentiality. We must insist that the doctrine of sin is the key to an understanding of society’s problems. “All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God”: not merely because all men sin deliberately and consciously, but because all are members of a fallen humanity: all share in a disordered scheme: none can escape the consequence of the Great Refusal made by our earliest human ancestors. Sin is essentially a spiritual condition, a quality of the will; and what makes life a tragedy is sin rather than sins. In Adam, then, all die—“death” here being a comprehensive, symbolic description of the moral and spiritual, as well as the physical effects of sin; even so in Christ shall all be made alive. It was the very purpose of the Incarnation to create, it is the very *raison d’être* of the Church to continue, a New Humanity: a humanity in which good, not evil, is the stronger force; a humanity redeemed, restored, rescued, saved.

The New Testament is full of this thought of Christ as giving mankind a *fresh start*. Mankind has been lifted out of the old order into a new: delivered from the power of darkness and translated into the Kingdom of the Son of God’s Love. United to Christ, humanity begins again. When a person is baptized, he becomes that which before baptism he was not: a member of Christ; he is now “in” Christ, one of that vast company which constitutes the New Humanity. By his baptism “there is a new creation,” a new thing: something is there which was not there before: a change has taken place in the constituents of the cosmos—a move in the direction of that Redemption which is

the ultimate, eternal and unalterable purpose of God who created it. And we may notice, in passing, how wide is the gulf which separates Catholic thought about the New Order, inaugurated by the Redeemer Himself, into which individuals are brought by the Holy Spirit in baptism, from all modern doctrines, miscalled "liberal," about the inevitable and all but automatic "progress" and perfectibility of man. There is nothing in common between the New Testament doctrine of man and the attenuated Gospel which says, "Be good, and seek God's help when you feel you can't manage without it; stand on your own feet, and the grace of God will prove invaluable when you require extra support." The New Testament insists, on the contrary, that only "in Christ," only as a member of the Redeemed Community, can you live, stand, walk, achieve any real victory over sin at all; in Adam all die. Except a man be born anew, of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the New Order—the Kingdom of God.

Our urgent need, then, is for a theology which shall also be a sociology: for a faith related to the object of Divine Redemption. It becomes more evident with every week that passes that secular civilization does not possess the interior resources to arrest its own collapse. Where shall society look for an indication of the directions in which it may find the solution of its problems, if not to the Church, the Body of Christ, the instrument for the accomplishment of His purpose on earth? The Church may, of course—God forbid that she should!—refuse the challenge presented by the "world-situation." In that case—for they are surely right who think that the prevailing mood of scepticism is not likely to be permanent—we may expect to see the Western world flooded with crude and monstrous parodies of religion, such as the racial superstitions which have already made such headway in Germany; and history will write over our own generation Mr. R. H. Tawney's terrible epitaph on the Christianity of seventeenth-century England: "The social teaching of the Church had ceased to count, because the Church herself had ceased to think."

CYRIL E. HUDSON.

THE INTERPRETER SPIRIT

PART I

THREE promises were made by Jesus shortly before He departed from the disciples—He would prepare a place for them, He would come again, and in the meantime He would send the

Holy Spirit. The mission of the Spirit was expressly contingent upon the withdrawal of Jesus from the world. The disciples and the Christian community which they were to create were no longer to be dependent for inspiration, for guidance, and for teaching upon Jesus, but upon the abiding presence of the Holy Spirit. The Spirit would take the place of Jesus in their midst. Yet this specific promise of the Lord has been very largely forgotten by the Church, certainly by its so-called orthodox sections. Some parts of the Christian community—the Quakers, the Wesleyans, and organizations like the Keswick Convention, and the various “Holiness” movements—have not been so forgetful. But in our own Church the function of the Spirit, His presence, and even the facts of His nature and Person, have receded into the background of teaching and worship, save for some spasmodic efforts of exhortation at Whitsuntide.

No doubt we can point to certain definite causes for this remissness. When Christian doctrine was being defined in early centuries, the creed-makers were occupied chiefly with the personality of the Son and His relation to the Father, and although the Cappadocians made a great effort to concentrate the attention of the Church also upon the doctrine of the Spirit, they were not finally successful. Secondly, the difficulty of obtaining clear ideas about the Spirit has at all times militated against an adequate apprehension of Him by the Church, save by the mystics, and by those gifted with what has been termed prophetic insight. There is little difficulty in forming clear notions about the Father, and the New Testament, through the Incarnation, defines for us sufficiently the nature of the Son. But close and unusual observation is required to appreciate the function and nature of the Spirit. Thirdly, the concentration of the mind of the Church upon the doctrine of the presence of Jesus in the Eucharist, and upon the doctrine of sacramental grace, has not only deflected our attention from the Holy Spirit, but has to some extent obscured Him in our spiritual vision.*

I drew attention to this fact in my little book on *The Holy Spirit*, where I also contrasted the promise of Jesus in relation to the Spirit and the promise of Jesus in relation to Holy Communion. But on reconsideration I can think of no passage in Scripture which expressly makes the latter promise. Whether the Church has rightly interpreted the words of institution as a promise of His presence in Communion we are not called upon now to discuss. I described the spiritual presence of Jesus in Communion as a contact established by Him from beyond the veil, from the other side, in contrast with the presence of the Spirit on this side of the veil, in Christian personality and in the

* Cf. *The Holy Spirit* (S.P.C.K.), Chapter I.

Church. In a word, in Communion we experience the presence of the transcendent God, in the Spirit the presence of the immanent God. But be this line of interpretation valid or not, it is clear that emphasis upon the presence of Jesus in Holy Communion has been a contributing cause of our neglect of the presence of Jesus in the Spirit. When He said, "I will be with you all the days," did He not almost certainly refer to His promise of the Holy Spirit? Are these words in any way related to Holy Communion?

Let us, then, try to get some definite ideas about the Holy Spirit in relation first to the Godhead, and secondly to mankind and the world. It is probable that we shall never progress very far beyond the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity in connection with the first of these questions—at any rate, not until we are vouchsafed some further revelation from on high. This conclusion has been emphasized by Karl Barth. It is one of his chief propositions in the first volume of the *Dogmatik*,* which, in contrast with the *Römerbrief*, represents a considered and well-thought-out scheme of Christian doctrine.

Barth admits that the Trinitarian doctrine is the product of the Church. Yet the Church has declared that she did not discover this doctrine for herself, but only in the testimony of revelation which founded the Church—namely, in the prophets and apostles of the Old and New Testaments—and he quotes the relevant passages (*Dogmatik*, I. 151 f.). But Karl Barth throws out a noteworthy caution. The term "personality," when used of God, does not signify "person" in the normal sense. If "person" in the Trinitarian definition means "personality," we arrive at Tritheism. Personality is no other than the constitutory moment of the essence (*Wesens*) of God. Personality is that which supplies the Godhead with identity; it is a predicate of Godhead as a whole, not of Fatherhead, Sonship or Spirit. "There can be no conception of a threefold consciousness of God" (*ibid.*, p. 162 f.). Gwatkin came close to a tritheistic interpretation when he defined the Trinity as three points in the consciousness of God. On the other hand, it is not clear that Barth does not approach the Sabellian view when, after guarding against the definition of a Person, a subject in the usual sense, he goes on to say that God is three modes in which the one personally, and for Himself thinking and willing God and Lord, grounding Himself through Himself, is (*ibid.*, p. 163). Probably it is impossible, when we come to definition, to escape altogether from either a tritheistic or Sabellian bias, according to our own preference or training. Barth seems to treat the difficulty as well as is possible to human intellect by stressing triunity in

* First edition 1927. The second edition (1932) should be consulted.

God, rather unity and trinity, or unity with trinity. Even so, the triunity is related rather to the economic aspect of the Godhead, to its operation upon the world and man. Triunity "is only a principle of the divine action: in every action of God the essence (*Wesen*) of God, and also His three inseparable persons are active, since they cannot separate themselves in their action but only act together" (*ibid.*, p. 167; cf. p. 215). The ecclesiastical doctrine of the Trinity is a legitimate answer to the question of the possibility of a revelation of the Father when it originally and rightly directed itself to *God*, to the whole God, without reservation and diminution. God is wholly in His revelation (*ibid.*, p. 198). The Father is not without the Son, and the Son is not without the Spirit of the Father and the Son (*ibid.*, p. 414). God is the Revealer, the Revelation, and the Revealed (*ibid.*, p. 126).

Barth accepts the orthodox doctrine of the double procession of the Spirit, but admits that, like the generation of the Son, the procession of the Spirit remains unknown (*ibid.*, p. 213). The statement must be accepted as it stands; we cannot explain it, and if the Western view of the procession endangers to some extent the idea of the unity of the Godhead, yet it does express the New Testament conception of the Spirit, and we are not called to surrender it (*ibid.*, p. 214).

There can be little doubt that the tritheistic tendency in the Trinitarian doctrine rightly creates anxiety in Karl Barth's exegesis, and he draws attention to a danger which should always be kept in view. If we apprehend personality in God as three Persons in the usual sense, if we separate the one from the other in our conception, we are in danger of setting up a quaternity—Fatherhood, Sonship, Spirit and Godhead—the Godhead being set over against these three Persons as the substance of each.* God is one, sometimes revealed to us as Father, sometimes as Son, sometimes as Spirit, sometimes as Son and Spirit together, sometimes—for example, at the baptism of Jesus—as Father, Son and Spirit together.

On the other hand, the triunity of God is not a mere contingency of the economy or of the revelation. Triunity exists in the inner being of God and is essential for His constitution as a Person. Otherwise we merely conceive a monad, a cold and lonely substance or notion of divinity, at the best a monotheism in the bare philosophic or Muhammadan sense (cf. *The Holy Spirit*, p. 128). Barth's teaching comes as a refreshing reintegration of our faith in the orthodox doctrine of the Holy Spirit against the interpretation of writers like Leisegang (*Pneuma Hagion*, 1922), who, while admitting that there may be

* Cf. Barth, *Dogmatik*, I. 162, and my *Holy Spirit*, p. 127.

specifically Christian elements in the statements of Matthew and Mark on the Holy Spirit, sees rather the influence of the Greek mysteries in the statements of Luke, the Fourth Gospel and the Pauline writings. This question is not greatly affected by the date of the Fourth Gospel, for the resemblance between its teaching on the Holy Spirit and that of the Synoptists is so clear that it appears to embody quite early teaching. But it is not clear that Leisegang has really made up his mind. In the preface to his book he says that his object is not to trace Greek thought in the New Testament, but to put the question, What did the statements of the New Testament on the Holy Spirit mean for the Greek world? Yet his conclusion is that our principal sources are the work of Hellenistic Christianity. Leisegang is a disciple of Harnack.

In recent times attention has been drawn to the confusion of New Testament and early patristic thought on the relationship of the Spirit to the Son. Early exegesis wavered between Trinitarian and Binitarian notions, and there are indications that the idea of the threefold character of God was upon the verge of being surrendered for a twofold definition. This tendency I have discussed elsewhere (*The Holy Spirit*, pp. 68 ff.), and it was treated by Canon Raven in *The Creator Spirit* (pp. 18 ff.), and over-emphasized, as I think, by Dr. E. F. Scott in *The Spirit in the New Testament* (pp. 177 ff.). The most thorough examination of the question appears in Dr. Kirk's chapter in *Essays on the Trinity and the Incarnation* (pp. 159 ff.) He says:

"On this theory we see an original Jewish unitarianism, developed first into a credal binitarianism (God and Christ), and then into a trinitarian formula, through the introduction of the Church; the formula in its turn evolving a trinitarian *belief* by the attaching of the conception of divinity first of all . . . to the second Person, and finally to the third, under the influence of an entirely *a priori* dialectic" (p. 181 f.). . . . "The evidence of the New Testament is singularly disconcerting. Read in the light of the later faith of the Church, it presents an almost explicit Trinitarianism. Read apart from that light—as modern theology attempts to read it—it presents an almost inextricable confusion of ideas . . . to us it appears that this is due not to a slow but essentially unilinear development of the doctrine, but rather to a struggle between a binitarian and trinitarian interpretation of the Christian facts—a struggle which maintained itself for nearly four centuries" (p. 199).

Dr. Kirk shews that this tendency was supported by "a strong weight of contemporary pagan and precedent Jewish thought" (pp. 182-199). He then examines the relevant passages in the New Testament. He admits that the baptismal formula of Matt. xxviii. 19 and the formula of blessing in

2 Cor. xiii. 14 are genuine Trinitarian statements, and that similar passages are to be found in 1 Cor. xii. 4-6; Eph. iv. 4, 5; Eph. ii. 18; 2 Thess. ii. 13, 14; Rom. v. 5-8; Rom. viii. 11; and Eph. i. 17 (p. 200 *f.*); but an examination of the opening invocations in seventeen epistles shews that in thirteen of them the gifts of grace and peace

“are specifically mentioned as coming from ‘God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ’; in two there is specific mention of the first two Persons of the Trinity in the same context, though not definitely as the source of grace; in one (Colossians) the reading varies between ‘from God’ and ‘from God and Christ’; in one only (1 Peter) is there any mention of the Spirit at all, and then not as a source of grace. Of the formulæ of thanksgiving or blessing which in eleven cases follow the opening salutation, three are addressed to the Father alone, one to the Father and Son, six to the Father with an immediate and closely related mention of the Son (*e.g.*, ‘the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ’); one is quite vague; but in not a single case is there any mention of the Spirit at all. These facts are startling in their importance. Here are formulæ as fixed and solid in their way as the baptismal formula itself; twenty-two of them are definitely binitarian, only one is trinitarian” (p. 204).

Dr. Kirk maintains that the Fourth Evangelist “identifies the gift of the Spirit with the return of Christ; and, in contradiction to the whole outlook of the Biblical writers, ignores any presence of the Spirit in the world until ‘Jesus is glorified’” (John vii. 39) (p. 207 *f.*). But he has to admit that other passages in St. John “distinguish clearly between the Spirit and Christ” (*i.e.*, John xiv. 16, 26; xv. 26; xvi. 7). Now I think that while his treatment of the opening passages in the Pauline and other epistles is most cogent, Dr. Kirk has over-emphasized the binitarian tendencies in St. John, and under-stressed the definitely Trinitarian implications of the Fourth Gospel. Yet he does not hand over the orthodox doctrine to modern binitarian thought. After tracing binitarianism in the writers of the first four centuries, where undoubtedly it exists, he points out that “the long drawn out battle between binitarianism and Trinitarianism came to a head in the final stages of the Arian controversy,” when Trinitarianism ultimately triumphed (p. 217 *f.*). He admits that “whatever may be said in favour of a binitarian basis for the theologies of St. Paul or St. John, there can be no doubt that, taken in gross and together, they suggest strongly a trinitarian system” (p. 220). He also alleges that the theological and philosophical vindication of the divinity of the Spirit in the fourth century had no grounds for its belief (p. 221; *cf.* p. 224). The transition from binitarianism to Trinitarianism begins with Augustine (p. 224), although it does not become finally grounded until it finds its centre in Christian experience,

especially in relation to the experience of conversion and the conception of grace (p. 226 ff.).

The persistence of binitarian ideas is illustrated by the fact that even Karl Barth in some of his earlier statements was under its influence;* and even in his little book, *Zur Lehre vom Heiligengeist*, which deals with the Spirit in relation to man, he has not yet entirely dissociated the Spirit from the Logos.

Dr. Kirk's chapter is the most valuable contribution to the early history of the doctrine of the Trinity and of the Holy Spirit which has appeared among English writers in recent years. But there is a danger lest his tempered consideration of binitarianism may become depressed from its balance by other writers. In the following chapter in the same work Mr. Green seems to have thrown his weight on to the binitarian side of the scale. While there is much that is new and stimulating in his treatment of Trinitarian doctrine—for example, the emphasis laid on “the line of tradition represented by Theophilus, Ignatius, Irenæus, Paul of Samosata, Dionysius of Rome, Marcellus of Ancyra,” against the more generally followed track laid down by Justin Martyr, Origen, the Alexandrian and Cappadocian schools—and also in his defence of Paul of Samosata, yet he falls into disproportion in tracing out the presence and effect of binitarian concepts, and is he quite justified when he remarks that the Cappadocians “are clearly at a loss to find a place for [the doctrine of] the Spirit”? (p. 280). It may be that the Cappadocians were struggling with the difficulty created for Trinitarian thought by binitarian predilections, but their endeavour was made with the express object of working out the conceptions of the Spirit's personality and divinity, and they cannot be fairly charged with failure if traces of binitarian influence are to be found in some of their statements.

It is probable that Christian thought has little to gain by continuing its speculation on the nature of the Holy Spirit in the being of God. It will be necessary from time to time to restate Trinitarian doctrine, and even to bring to the restatement whatever assistance may be derived from the changing forms of philosophic thought. But this will probably result in little more than a reassertion of the old doctrine, and if its phraseology changes, it will rather be in the direction of illustration than definition. On the other hand, there are many signs that the time has arrived for the attempt to be made to redefine the relationship of the Holy Spirit to man and the world, and if this tendency is developed, something may result of a practical character to reawaken the Christian consciousness to the

* Cf. *Dogmatik*, I. 192, 199 ff.; *Word of God and Man*, p. 93; *Römerbrief*, fifth edition, pp. 281 f.

neglected promise of our Lord, "I will send unto you the Paraclete." The Church needs to realize that it lives in the era of the Spirit's mission. The period of the Incarnation is over. Is it wise to attempt its extension by developing the theory and practice of the Eucharist? Is not the true line of advance to take Christ at His word, and to relate human conditions immediately rather to the Spirit than to the divine Son?

If one takes a broad view of contemporary thought, one sees that it is occupied rather with predicates than with subjects, or, to change the terms of the comparison, with the subjective or individual aspect of religion rather than with its object; and by its object, of course, is meant not its purpose, but its goal and inspiration. We are occupied rather with worship and its concomitants than with the object and inspiration of worship, which is God. Or we are occupied with the effects of religion upon individuals, or with the origin and function of the religious consciousness, again to the exclusion of the divine source of the religious message and the divine source of the inspiration of the human soul. We talk about the religious man and not about God, and we have carried our psychological reasoning to such a length that we are in danger of reconstructing our view of God from the elements of human consciousness revealed in the crucible of psychological analysis—a view of God which has little in common with the God of revelation. The human psychological "I think" is being set up over against the divinely revealed "I say." As Barth urges, we need to get back to the "Thus saith the Lord!" of the prophetic era; and the instrument of that voice, of that Word of the revealing God, since Jesus went back to the Father, is the Holy Spirit.

The method and results of modern investigation are illustrated by Canon Raven's Hulsean Lectures, entitled the *Creator Spirit*. They trace the creative influence of Spirit through the different phases of human thought and the different processes of human evolution. But he does not in this book really come to grips with his subject—the Holy Spirit. He is occupied all the time with his predicate—the Creator—and he might as well have used the title "The Creator God" for these lectures. So far from clarifying our Trinitarian thought by setting forth the Spirit of God in a more distinct aspect, Canon Raven leaves the problem still obscure by concentrating our attention on the central constituting feature of Trinitarian doctrine, the Godhead, if not the Fatherhood. But Professor Raven has made a great advance by his pronouncement on the early date of St. John's Gospel, delivered in his later book (*The Gospel of Love*). He should now be able to proceed to a more clearly defined exposition of the doctrine of the Spirit, and we look forward to such a

book from his hand. A similar criticism must be offered to Dr. Wheeler Robinson's book, *The Christian Experience of the Holy Spirit*. Less biological than Dr. Raven's book, and more consistent in the development of its thesis, it still does not raise our eyes much above the level of human experience. It contains a good deal about that matter, and for this we are grateful, but it offers little about the Holy Spirit for whom we seek.

We have seen that binitarian thought confuses the functions of Son and Spirit. This confusion also extends by implication to the functions of Father and Son, and leads on to Unitarianism. Who is the Creator? If the prologue to St. John's Gospel is read carelessly, we may answer "The Son," and shall at once confuse the function of Father and Son, just as when Genesis i. 2 is read carelessly we may again confuse the functions of Father and Spirit. I do not say that the confusion actually exists in Scripture, but it is apt to arise in our interpretation of Scripture. What Genesis says is that "in the beginning . . . God said," and creation took place. This *word* of God was creative. The prologue to St. John reports that all things in the beginning were made by the "Word," who was "with God" and "was God." Two functions are indicated. Creation is a function of fatherhood in the sense of initiation, and in the biological sphere in the sense of procreation. *Pro*-creation is a clue to the true meaning of creation when the term is applied to the origin of the universe. The initial act is something which precedes the actual process of the creating phase. The Father planned and devised, as an architect plans and devises before handing his drawing over to the builder. The builder makes manifest, reveals to the uninitiated eye the architect's plan when he presents the finished structure. Building is a manifestation, a revelation, and the builder is a revealer. Who is the revealer in the cosmology of the universe? Surely the divine Son, who carried into operation the Father's plan. This is the meaning of the prologue to St. John: "All things were made by Him; without Him was not anything made that was made."

The "making" of the universe is a revelation, and the medium of that action, the organ of revelation, is the Son. The Son is the revealer, and in the book of Nature we read the sentences of the divine Word. Now this is Barthian language, but it is hardly Barthian thought, for Karl Barth defines the Father as the Revealer, and the Son as Revelation or utterance, or Word. But revealer and revelation are the same; the spoken word and its contents are one for all intents and purposes. The distinction arises, as we have seen, in the origin of the content of revelation, and this origin is the Father, who created the scheme carried out by the Son. Let us not meanwhile lose sight of the great

value of the Barthian concept in stressing the function of the Son as Word or revelation. Since there is thought behind the word, in that thought lies the creative function of the Father. Creation is thought, not action; it is scheme, not construction.

The Son is God the Revealer, and His work is shewn to us in different phases. After the revelation of the Father's original plan at "Creation," the Word (Logos) reveals the Father's purpose for the moral and spiritual development of man through the prophets' language, through the Old Testament. The revelation of the Old Testament is a function of the Son, or the Word of God. The supreme phase of the operation of the Son or Word of God in relation to man was the Incarnation, when the Word became incarnate in the human life of Jesus, and manifested the revelation now in personal human form, suffering and rising again. God the Revealer is now God the Redeemer, and the revelation of God's nature, of redeeming love, is gloriously and triumphantly completed by His rising from the dead. The Resurrection and Ascension are the last speaking, manifesting deeds of the Word made flesh. But the work of the Revealer went on; He took up again the work abandoned when the last Old Testament prophet spoke. Now to evangelist and apostle He spake again to man, continuing the revelation. So the revelation of the New Testament is a function of the Son, or Word of God.

God the Creator—the Father; God the Builder and Revealer—the Word, the Son; and now God the Interpreter—the Spirit. The function of interpretation seems to be the specific function of the Holy Spirit. There is a certain resemblance and yet a large difference between this notion and the Barthian conception of the Spirit. Barth perceives the Spirit's influence in the substance of revelation, as distinguished from its process and origin. So he describes the triunity as Revealer, Revelation, and Revealed. We have already telescoped the two first terms and concentrated them in the function of the Word, or the Son. So far as the written word of Scripture interprets, as a *written word*, the process of revelation and the revealer Himself, we may perhaps accept Barth's third term. But only with reserve, for Scripture itself needs an interpreter; it is not its own interpreter. Herein lies the special function of the Spirit.

In the creative process it takes the form of a gradual organization and development of what has been created. The Spirit "moves on the face of the waters," fills in the "waste," and peoples the "void" with life (Gen. i. 2, R.V.). He gives meaning to the created world, and so interprets it. When we turn to the Spirit's function as the interpreter of revelation in Scripture we find it outlined in Christ's words: "Howbeit when He, the Spirit of Truth, is come, He shall guide you into all the

truth: for He shall not speak from Himself; but whatsoever things He shall hear, these shall He speak; and He shall declare unto you the things that are to come" (John xvi. 13). This is, I think, the classical passage in the Bible for the Spirit's interpretative function. It is a revealed word about the Spirit. In this word the Son reveals the Spirit's function. The Spirit shall guide into all the truth—that is in itself the function of interpretation—a guide to the truth can be nothing short of an interpreter of truth. The content, the subject of the Spirit's interpretation is the Word itself, the Word Himself. "I am the truth," said Christ. "He shall not speak from Himself, but what things soever He shall hear, these shall He speak." The Spirit takes the Word (Logos) and speaks—i.e., interprets. But it is the interpretation of a personal Word, the interpretation of Him: "He shall bear witness of *Me*" (John xv. 26).

A. J. MACDONALD.

SAUL AND DAVID

A STUDY OF THE CONFLICT BETWEEN NORTHERN PROPHECY AND SOUTHERN PRIESTHOOD

THE story of Saul and David, written in the first book of Samuel, appears at first sight to be a plain account of the personal rivalry between two national leaders. Generally, however, the Editors of the historical books had religious and what may be called professional motives, which determined their treatment and arrangement of the materials at their disposal. They nearly always had particular points of view which they desired to propagate, and which impelled them to preserve and record the history and traditions which had been handed down to them.

The story of Saul and David is not an exception. Beneath the artistic narrative can be detected the clash of great forces which are more than personal in character; and the Editor delicately, but firmly, develops his interpretation of the history with which he is dealing. He wrote with the dominant conviction that God controlled the past and its results, and that the events of history made clear the divine standards and judgments.

The plain fact of history in the story before us is the failure of Saul and the triumph of David—evidently, according to the Editor, two parts of one problem. We must ask the reasons. The more obvious at once come to our notice in the narrative. Saul's jealousy of David, so essentially personal and unjust,

though human, was due to his natural fear of one who increasingly proved that he was more fitted for the kingship than himself. But the source of the explanation of the whole problem is that Saul died a defeated warrior in the battle against the Philistines. The Philistines were threatening the very existence of the Israelites as a race—they were not yet a nation—and it was out of this struggle that the nation was born. Saul was at first eminently successful as a warrior, so successful, in fact, that he was promoted from being Judge to be first king of Israel. But in the end he fell defeated; and even before the final disaster his prowess had been excelled by David. An echo of the intensity of the struggle and the rivalry has been preserved in a popular song: "Saul has slain his thousands, but David his ten thousands" (1 Sam. xviii. 7, xxi. 11, xxix. 5).

The Editor sees the hand of God in Saul's failure. In the books of Joshua and Judges it is always assumed that defeat is due to the nation's sin, whereas in the narrative of 1 Samuel Saul is regarded as the culprit, and the people are never blamed. What was Saul's sin? This is the crux of the problem.

An account is given in 1 Sam. xv. of the king's failure to carry out the command to exterminate the Amalekites. Perhaps there is preserved in this narrative a trace of the events which brought about his downfall, but the problem must have been much deeper than a single act of disobedience. Nor is there any apparent connection between this story and the tragedy on the battlefield of Gilboa. Besides, Saul knew before the battle that God was not favouring his cause, but does not seem to know the reason, in spite of his anxious enquiries. In fact, we must try to find out why God withdrew the favour He had hitherto manifested and by what means Saul knew that it had been withdrawn. The defeat and death were the vindication of the judgment already made and known.

Since God determined the issue of battles, Saul, like any other champion, desired to know the divine will before undertaking any engagement. (Compare Ahab's anxious enquiry before going up to Ramoth-gilead in 1 Kings xxii.) Only if Yahweh was "pleased," could victory be expected. Moreover, according to the quasi-materialistic conception of God, the methods of discovering the divine pleasure were equally practical and naïve. One such method was the Oracle tree, which Saul probably used, like the Judges who preceded him (1 Sam. xxii. 6), though it seems that this was rather a means of knowing the right moment in which to attack than of determining whether God favoured the issue of the engagement. (Compare especially 2 Sam. v. 23, 24.) A very prominent method of discovering the divine will was that of the Ephod, an image or sacred box, which was probably a

method of drawing lots to denote the answers yes or no. (Compare *Encyc. Brit.*, eleventh edition, p. 550, n. 2, accepted by Eerdmanns. Also see *Harvard Theological Studies*, vol. iii.) The Ephod was an essentially priestly method of enquiry—a fact which we must note here, as it will prove to be of exceptional importance for this study.

What use did Saul make of this means? In 1 Sam. xiv. he is about to attack the Philistines. Notice how quietly but how carefully the Editor tells us in minute detail of the presence of "Ahijah, the son of Ahitub, Ichabod's brother, the son of Phinehas, the son of Eli, the priest of Yahweh in Shiloh, carrying the ephod." Then in verse 17 we are told that Saul orders Ahijah to bring the sacred Ephod; after which there is a very curious passage, evidently recorded for a purpose, telling us that while the priest was enquiring, the tumult in the camp of the Philistines increased; and Saul not only refused to wait for the Oracle, but abruptly told the priest to withdraw his hand.

At verse 36 there is a development. Saul proposes to pursue the Philistines by night, and now the priest—not Saul—proposes that enquiry should be made. But no Oracle is given, and it is significant that Saul at once assumes that there is sin either in himself or in his house. (The LXX version of 1 Sam. xiv. 41 makes this clear.)

These two instances of consultation by the priestly Ephod and their results suggest that Saul was not favourably disposed to this means of discovering Yahweh's will; nor could he have relied on it to any considerable extent in his wars. Is it likely, then, that he would be friendly with the priesthood which controlled enquiry by means of the Ephod?

There is abundant evidence to shew that, on the contrary, he regarded the priests as his personal enemies. Note first how he sent Doeg, his chief herdsman, to spy on David and the priest Ahimelech at Nob, and note especially that he seems to have assumed that David would flee there (1 Sam. xxi. 7, xxii. 9, 10, and 22). Next, consider the significance of Saul's accusation that Ahimelech had given the fugitive not only bread and a sword, but had even enquired of Yahweh on his behalf. Again, we read that Ahimelech defends his protection of David, but is scrupulous and emphatic in his denial that he had enquired for him (1 Sam. xxii. 15). Indeed, his anxiety to clear himself in this respect seems to imply that to do such a thing would be treason implicating himself and his family. Certainly the king accuses him of conspiracy. But the most remarkable of the details in the narrative is Saul's command that all the priests of Yahweh should be massacred—no less than eighty-five of

them—and again because of their alleged conspiracy: “because their hand also is with David, and because they knew that he fled, and did not disclose it” (1 Sam. xxii. 17). Only one priest, Abiathar, escaped, and he straightway fled to David. We shall learn the significance of this later.

Saul’s persecution of the priests involved the loss of the chief means of divination, that indispensable requirement in warfare. He must somehow ensure that Yahweh’s pleasure and support should be made known. All the more significant, therefore, is his connection with the “nebi’im,” or prophets as they are called in the English versions, especially as they first emerge into history during his reign. Moreover, his association with them was regarded as so remarkable that it was commemorated in a popular proverb: “Is Saul also among the nebi’im?” (1 Sam. x. 11; cf. xix. 24). Evidently they were fanatical patriots, and therefore extremely valuable in a time of national crisis, but perhaps not regarded as sufficiently orthodox or respectable to justify Saul’s complete identification with them.

Yet the nebi’im failed him ultimately. The reason is not clear, though it is probable that Samuel had something to do with it, for he seems to have controlled them, although he did not identify himself with them (1 Sam. xix. 20; Elijah seems to have taken the same attitude). At any rate, Saul confesses that they had failed him, though here again it is important to note that it was their failure to obtain an “answer” which troubled him (1 Sam. xxviii. 6 and 15). Compare with this the very instructive parallel in 1 Kings xxii., in which it is clear that there were grave doubts whether the enquiry made by the nebi’im could be relied upon, in spite of their obvious patriotism. The importance of this matter is realized when we reflect on the influence which the certainty of Yahweh’s support must have had on the troops in battle, and the serious concern which any leader must have experienced when there was an uncertainty about it, or, worse still, when no answer to enquiries was forthcoming.

In desperation through his lack of an Oracle, Saul turned to necromancy for help, as described in the weird interview with the witch of Endor (1 Sam. xxviii.). At last he received an answer to his enquiries—his death sentence. The shade of Samuel reminded him of his failure to execute God’s wrath upon the Amalekites, but the Chronicler is probably more accurate in his judgment: “Saul died for his trespass which he committed against Yahweh, because of the word of Yahweh which he kept not, and also for that he asked counsel of one that had a familiar spirit, to enquire thereby, and he enquired not of Yahweh” (1 Chron. x. 13).

The significance of these facts becomes clearer when the details of David's career are considered. It is not surprising to find that Saul's rival relied on the priests for divination and support. We have already noted that he fled to Ahimelech for refuge—surely not by accident. Nor was he disappointed, for he received far more than a refuge. For food he was given the priestly shewbread, evidently a privilege (1 Sam. xxi. 2-6), and a sword, also no ordinary weapon, for it was called "the sword of the Philistine," and was preserved behind the Ephod (1 Sam. xxi. 8 and 9); and according to Doeg, the priest enquired of Yahweh on his behalf (1 Sam. xxii. 10).

The goodwill between David and the priesthood was even more evident when Saul's massacre at Nob was carried out. Abiathar, the sole survivor, at once fled to David, from whom he received a warm welcome (1 Sam. xxii. 23), but the welcome was not merely the payment of an old debt of kindness. David evidently intended to make good use of his priestly companion, above all, in the matter of divination. Abiathar consulted Yahweh by means of the Ephod no less than four times during one engagement on his behalf (1 Sam. xxiii. 1-13).

In agreement with this priestly alliance was David's care for the Ark, the great Ark which throughout its obscure history was nevertheless always associated with the priests. Somehow it had been unnoticed during Saul's reign, and Dr. Kennedy has suggested that it was because Kiriath Jearim, where the Ark lay, was still in the hands of the Philistines (Century Bible, Appendix). But it is definitely stated that it was returned to the Israelites at Kiriath Jearim, which implies that the city was now in the hands of the Israelites, and we are not told that the city or the Ark was lost again. Certainly, if the Ark was recaptured, there is no evidence that Saul ever shewed any concern about it. On the other hand, it comes to notice again during David's reign, and his care for it is specially noted. He provided for its triumphant bestowal at Jerusalem in priestly festival, while he himself, clad in the priestly ephod, danced before it (and thereby alienated Michal, who was a member of Saul's family). His regard for the Ark was permanent, as proved by his emotional concern for its safety during Absalom's revolt (2 Sam. xv. 24-29).

In fact, there is abundant evidence to prove that David was a friend of the priesthood and all its associations and institutions. His sons were priests (2 Sam. viii. 18) and he had priests among his chief counsellors (2 Sam. viii. 17). On the other hand, he never associated with the nebi'im, either in his struggle with Saul or in later years. Clearly Nathan and Gad belong to the seer type, as defined in 1 Sam. ix. 9. Nor does he shew any of the

characteristics of the nebi'im; on the contrary, he healed Saul's raving, which was obviously akin to the prophetic ecstasy, by means of music, whereas Saul's followers produced their raving by the same means (1 Sam. x. 5). In striking contrast with this is David's escape from the king of Gath by feigning madness (1 Sam. xxi. 12-15). It is hardly surprising, then, that he made no use of the nebi'im, since he thought thus of their dominant characteristic. Not that he lacked the spirit of Yahweh; it came mightily upon him; not, however, in the prophetic ecstasy, but at the priestly anointing (1 Sam. xvi. 13).

Thus the struggle between Saul and David was much more than a merely personal rivalry. It concerned the relationship between the old-established, orthodox priesthood and the apparently new and hardly respectable nebi'im. There was not, so far as we can see, a struggle between the two professions, but a rigid demarcation. Was the division due entirely to the conservative suspicion of the priesthood? It is hardly likely. Probably the explanation is to be found in the geographical circumstances of the struggle.

Consider the origins of the two rivals. Saul was a Benjamite, and therefore northern by birth and associations. (Compare 2 Sam. xix. 20, which shews that Benjamin was regarded as a northern tribe.) More than this, he was supreme in the north; he controlled Ephraim, the tribe which controlled the lion's share of pre-eminence, according to Joshua and Judges. He defeated Ammon and Gilead and Moab, and was victorious as far as Zobah. But though a northerner, and victorious in his own neighbourhood, he also extended his kingdom southwards. Naturally the Editor assumes that as king he controlled Judah, but that is because he edited his sources in the light of later history. We know that the cleavage between the northern and the southern tribes had its origin long before the death of Solomon—probably during the sojourning of certain tribes in Egypt. Hence Saul's control in the south must have been the result of conquest; and this is the more significant in view of the fact that it was in the south that he pursued David. For David was a southerner—as much a southerner as Saul was a northerner. His home was at Bethlehem. He married two wives in the south, and one of them was a widow of very great wealth (1 Sam. xxv. 2 f.). Again, we are told that David, with his customary tact, cultivated the approval of the influential elders of the south by giving them presents from the spoil of Ziklag (1 Sam. xxvii. 10).

The inference from these details is clear. Saul the northerner relied on the nebi'im, who, so far as we can tell from their subsequent history, were a product of the north; and when he attempted to extend his kingdom in the south, he came into con-

flict with both David, the champion of the south, and the priesthood, which also belonged essentially to that part. His massacre of the priests at Nob, and the fact that David was obviously little more than a dependent at Saul's court at times, proves the extent of the ability and power of the first king of Israel. His greatness may also be estimated by a consideration of the enormous difficulties which he had to face—the opposition of David, the menace of the Philistines, and, not least, the chain of non-Israelite cities which stretched from east to west and severed his northern territory from Judah. Even this last problem he faced with his accustomed vigour, by attacking the Gibeonites, who formed a semi-independent league, and were perhaps priestly in sympathy (2 Sam. xxi.). Note, too, that David assumes that certain Negeb districts were under Saul's control (1 Sam. xxvii. 10).

Such were the relations between Saul and David. This examination shews that Saul was a much greater king than the Editor suggests, though his cold summary of the king's achievements in 1 Sam. xiv. 17 and 18 is remarkable enough. It was the clash between two neighbouring kings, but the Editor was able to relate the history as though it were rather the supersession of one king by another according to the command of God. It did amount to that ultimately. But the most striking fact which such a close examination as this reveals is the demarcation between the prophets and the priests, and the fact that this demarcation was largely the result of geographical conditions, together with the dire results of Saul's oppression of the priests. It is fitting to conclude by pointing out that the Editor was consistent to the main fact of the history of the struggle in giving as the cause of Saul's downfall his disobedience to the command of Samuel, that somewhat legendary figure who is at least as much a priest as he is a seer.

M. KIDDLE.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

OUR first article this month is by a distinguished Roman Catholic layman, author of *Progress and Religion, The Making of Europe A.D. 400-1000*, and other well-known studies in the history of human culture. His essay was read to a small group at All Saints, Margaret Street, and we print it with peculiar pleasure. Canon Hudson, of St. Albans, Editor of the *Teaching Church Review*, handles a kindred subject with equal power. Dr. Macdonald, one of the leading English exponents of "the theology of crisis," applies it in a direction where exploration is much needed. The remainder of his paper will appear next month.

Mr. Kiddle is a young recruit who has become known as an ally of the Bishop of Durham in the Group Controversy. "Saul and David" is wholly unconnected with that subject, but it shews that in Mr. Kiddle we have a theologian of promise.

A correspondent, reading Mr. de Candole's article in the December number, was reminded of a certain paper published for the National Mission in 1916. Like so much else that came from that gifted and devoted man, Henry Scott Holland, it deserves to be republished and widely read.

CONFESSION

(NATIONAL MISSION PAPER 278)

SIN can never be merely a private and individual affair. Our belief in Christ's atoning power rests on our recognition that in and by our personal sin we witness to the sin that is in us all. By our own sin we allow the whole kingdom of sin to push forward its frontier, to take up a fresh outpost within the domain of Christ. We make our contribution to the great sum of evil. We have added to its weight and volume. We have reinforced the pressure by which it for ever drives up against the Kingdom of Righteousness. We have betrayed the great cause to which we were pledged. Therefore our sin has consequences far beyond ourselves. Those who stand for God are the weaker because of us and those who war against God are the stronger. The situation has worsened through our betrayal. For we are of the Body of Christ, and if one member suffers, all suffer; and if one sins, all must be injured. We have lowered the spiritual vitality of the Body. We have helped to obscure its vision, to trouble its conscience and defeat its purpose. For we who were sworn to its service have failed to fulfil our part just where it looked for us to act.

This is the dreadful truth that comes home to many of us as we recognize how deeply in sinning against ourselves we have sinned against the Brotherhood of Christ; and therefore we feel a strong desire to make some reparation to the brethren for the wrong we have done them. We earnestly

wish to acknowledge this corporate villainy of our sin. As it has been an injury done to Christ in His Body, so it is to Christ in and through His Body that we would bring our sore sorrow for it. We turn to that Body which we have offended and disgraced, and we crave to be restored to our true relationship within it. We feel that we have not owned up to our full shame in sinning if we have not confessed the dishonour done to the Name, the disloyalty to the Holy Society, the social criminality. Penitently, therefore, we would ask to be forgiven for the injury done to those whose life we share; and we approach the Body of the Forgiven that we may once again be overswept by the pardoning love which is its very life. There are authorized ways by which this Body can be so approached and through which its restorative powers can flow back on our souls. Through these, as we are assured by our Book of Prayer, we may hear the Voice of the Master accepting our confession, forgiving our sin and giving us back our place in His Body, there to live and work for Him and for all who are alive in Him. Christ alone absolves; but it is fit and right and profoundly touching that His absolution should use as its organ that Body of His which it is our sorrow and our shame to have insulted by our sin. Through its ordained ministry we receive into our humble hearts the healing of His Hands, the cloud is lifted, and the trouble scattered. The covenant of mercy receives its seal of assurance.

"Our soul is escaped as a bird out of the snare of the fowler. The snare is broken and we are escaped."

"Our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath left power to His Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in Him, of His great mercy forgive thee thine offences: and by His authority committed to me, I absolve thee from all thy sins, In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen."

HENRY SCOTT HOLLAND.

ARCHBISHOP SÖDERBLOM

WE should count it a remarkable thing if, two years after the death of an Archbishop of Canterbury, a volume of reminiscences were published contributed by seventy foreign writers, representing practically all the nations of Europe and the United States, and all the Churches, including the Church of Rome. It seems scarcely possible. Yet such a book has just appeared about the late Primate of Sweden, Archbishop Söderblom, in the series of *Hågkomster och livsintryck* (Memories and Impressions), published by J. A. Lindblads förlag, Uppsala.* One is astonished at the intimacy of the foreign friendships of this great Churchman, and at the vigour and the range of his activities. At the outbreak of war Dr. Albert Schweitzer had been a medical missionary in German West Africa; after the war he was living in Strasbourg, dispirited and in poor health; his work was gone and he seemed to be forgotten, when a letter arrived from the Archbishop, inviting him to lecture at Uppsala. Actually Söderblom had invited him earlier than had originally been planned, guessing that he was in need. He came and gave his lectures; and while the two of them were walking together under one umbrella on a rainy day in Uppsala, the Archbishop discovered that he had contracted debts on behalf of his

* The title of the book is *Hågkomster och livsintryck*. XIV. *Nathan Söderblom*. By seventy foreign contributors. (J. A. Linblads förlag, Uppsala, Sweden. 8 kr. 50.)

mission hospital in Africa, and saw no hope of paying them off. He soon had a proposal; why should not Dr. Schweitzer make a tour round Sweden, lecturing and giving organ recitals? He set to work, wrote the letters, made the arrangements; the greater part of the debt was paid off; and not only this, but Dr. Schweitzer regained strength and encouragement to take up his work again and reopen the mission hospital at Lambarene. A somewhat similar service was performed by the Archbishop about the same time for a Russian Orthodox, Dr. Glubokowsky. We hear a French Catholic lady, with whom he made friends while he was the Swedish Chaplain in Paris between 1895 and 1901, writing of him with the greatest respect and admiration; we hear how he endeavoured to persuade the Lutheran Bishops in Hungary to be reconsecrated and so brought within the *successio apostolica*. This is indeed a remarkable book, and one that reflects the greatest possible credit on the publishers. A. G. H.

NOTES ON PERIODICALS

Theologische Rundschau. 1933. Heft 5.

A valuable article by H. Windisch discusses the "parties" of the early Church and compares the views held by scholars today with those of F. C. Baur. We no longer contrast St. Paul and the Twelve, but make differentiations in Jewish Christendom, viz.: (1) the intransigent Judaism reflected in Galatians; (2) the strict Judaism, which was yet ready to tolerate freedom in gentile Christians, of James and the majority of the Church of Jerusalem (Acts xxi. 20); (3) the less narrow position of Peter; (4) pre-Pauline tendencies to sit loosely by the Law, as in Stephen's followers. Paul attacked only the first group. Lately, however, Meyer, Holl, Hirsch and Lietzmann have revived the Tübingen hypothesis of an anti-Peter polemic in Corinthians. Acute as the reasoning is, it has not been generally accepted.

As a result of Holl's investigations the hierarchical claims of Jerusalem and its primacy stand out clearly. The overthrow of Jerusalem left a vacant throne, which was later claimed by Rome.

The pre-Pauline Hellenistic community has been much studied, though there are no direct sources, only deductions from the Pauline Epistles. Still, "Paulinism" is now recognized as having been in large measure "received" by Paul. Bousset, Reitzenstein and others lay stress on Hellenistic "Mystik" as a main source; "Gnosticism" is seen to have existed from the first in the Gentile Church. The antithesis Paul-Jesus, or Paul-Jerusalem, stands out as clearly as in the days of the Tübingen School, but it is understood as a problem embracing all the syncretism of the age. Lastly, the chief problem of all, whether Jesus Himself in creative fashion took up the Iranian mythos of an *Urmensch*, and used it as the vehicle of His own Messianic consciousness, is still unsolved.

W. K. L. C.

Zeitschrift für die N.T.liche Wissenschaft. 1933. Heft 2/3.

S. MOWINCKEL has an important article on the Rabbinic conception of the Holy Spirit as Advocate (Paraclete) of the pious and accuser of the

godless. The functions of an angel were transferred to the Spirit, who was thought of as a Paraclete, highest of the angels. St. John makes him the Paraclete. L. ROST tells us about the new edition of the Damascus Sect document, which confirms the suspicions expressed by R. H. Charles respecting the *editio princeps* of Schechter. K. MÜLLER traces the use of *parochia* and *dioecesis* in the early Church. "Parish" meant the society of other-worldly people, who are strangers in this world; "diocese" was a word taken from the terminology of the imperial administration. "Parish" meant any Christian Community, whether or not it had a bishop. "Diocese" always kept the sense of a jurisdiction or unit of administration. E. VON DOBSCHÜTZ continues his cataloguing of N.T. MSS. O. SCHAEFER expounds "in my Father's house are many mansions"; "house," he holds, cannot mean heaven; it is rather the realm of God's power and love, which embraces both heaven and earth. W. K. L. C.

Zeitschrift für die A.T.liche Wissenschaft. 1933. Heft 2.

H. BAUER of Halle has a precious essay on the divinities found in the excavations at Ras Shamra (Northern Syria, 1900 to 1600 B.C. probably). "El" is the name of a definite god; this throws a new light on the El-religion of the Hebrew patriarchs. As 'l in early Semitic is a demonstrative pronoun, El may be a substitute for another name, a reverent "He." "Ēlah" (cf. Allah) is mentioned in contexts which differentiate it from "El." "Elohim" is the proper name of a god; so far as the Hebrews are concerned, any polytheistic suggestion is excluded. "Baal," exactly as in the O.T., is a proper name of a distinct god, but appears as the inhabitant of divers sanctuaries. The feminine "Baalath" also occurs; so does "Asistu" (Ashtaroth). "Anath" (worshipped at Elephantine in the fifth century by the Jewish colonists) is the messenger of the gods. The Philistine god Dagon occurs four times. The greatest surprise is to find a god "Yaw," son of El. Many O.T. opinions will have to be reconsidered in the light of this new knowledge. G. v. RAD, writing on false prophets, points out that there was no word for them in Hebrew. The difference was not one between false and true, but between an institution, a body of mediators between God and man, and those who, like Amos, were directly inspired.

R. PRESS begins a monograph on the Ordeal in ancient Israel. W. F. BADÈ (an American excavator) describes the excavations at Tell en-Nasbeh (Mizpah), where on April 22, 1932, he found the seal of "Jaazaniah, Servant of the King"—i.e., royal official. Under the words is a splendid representation of a game-cock with comb, wattle and spurs complete, in fighting attitude. Of the four Jaazaniahs mentioned in the O.T., the son of the Maacathite (2 Kings xxv. 23, Jer. xl. 8) was evidently the owner of the seal, for he was one of four "captains of the forces" who came to Mizpah to swear allegiance to Gedaliah. (The mention of the cock is interesting in connection with St. Peter's denial. Was the bird kept by the soldiers for cock-fighting?)

The Editor writes in an extraordinarily interesting fashion on the German excavations at Sichem, which have deservedly been criticized, and on the general problem of Palestinian archaeology. Who is to carry on the work? The excavator must be an archaeologist and an Old Testa-

ment specialist. The Exploration Societies are financed by Bible-lovers to produce results proving the truth of the Scriptures; consequently they tend to neglect what the archæologist deems essential. The recent shifting of interest away from archæology to central theological issues deprives science of workers and leaves the field to the classical archæologist who knows nothing of the O.T., or else to the Bible enthusiast who wants to prove his thesis.

W. K. L. C.

Analecta Bollandiana.

The current number (Tomus li., Fasc. iii. et iv.) is most interesting. It contains a hitherto unpublished Greek Life of Martin I. (649-655), that unfortunate Pope who, for refusing to accept Monothelitism, was carried off from Rome to Constantinople, where he died of ill-treatment.

The number also contains an interesting account of that portion of the relics of St. Ouen which was for centuries treasured at Canterbury Cathedral. The account is written by an anonymous scribe between A.D. 1125 and 1137. The writer of the article attributes the account to Eadmer, the biographer of Anselm.

An article on the nationality of St. Émilien de la Cogolla will interest fewer English readers, but an account of an alleged *Prophecy over Ireland* of St. Malachy is worth studying. The writer, Paul Grosjean, S.J., declares that it is only one among many so-called forged prophecies fathered on Irish saints with a political motive. This particular prophecy foretold seven centuries of oppression by the English and then freedom. The seven centuries, however, came to an end in 1869, about half a century too early. The writer of the article proves clearly that the prophecy is a forgery first printed in the *Life of Oliver Plunkett*, which was published in 1895. The genuineness of the prophecy has been rejected by scholars like H. J. Lawlor and M. J. F. Kenny, yet Canon James O'Boyle in his recently published *Life of St. Malachy, Patron Saint of Down and Connor*, has the hardihood to affirm that the original manuscript is in the Library of the Franciscans in Dublin. M. Grosjean affirms that he himself searched the Catalogue of MSS. in the Library in 1927 and failed to find the prophecy, that the librarian to whom he appealed is equally in the dark, and that "M. O'Boyle, whom he ventured to ask for an explanation, did not answer my letter."

An article entitled *Le Miracle Eucharistique de Bruxelles en 1370* examines critically and in detail one alleged miracle, which may be regarded as a type of many similar incidents, when the host was said to have bled after having been carried off and sacrilegiously treated by Jews.

There is a list of books in the Cathedral Library at Beneventum and the usual full account of hagiological publications.

C. P. S. C.

REVIEWS

CHRISTIANITY IN CELTIC LANDS. A History of the Churches of the Celts: their Origin, their Development, Influence, and Mutual Relations. By Dom Louis Gougaud, Benedictine Monk of St. Michael's Abbey, Farnborough. Translated from the Author's MS. by Maud Joynt. Sheed and Ward. 18s.

There are few subjects upon which it is easier for anyone with some acquaintance with hagiology to write vigorously and picturesquely than Celtic Christianity, just as there are few which afford a better discipline in historical criticism; and he is a poor historical student indeed upon whose mind and imagination the literature exercises no attraction. Yet it is surprising how seldom the functions of the writer and the critic have been successfully combined. For the descriptive writer the union of romantic piety and pious romance in the authorities before him supplies the stimulus needed to set his own faculty to work, and he is apt to be a little lenient (and who shall blame him?) when he finds himself confronted with a good story. The researcher, on the other hand, who is almost invariably qualified *honoris causa* by the epithet of "patient," in his zest for "facts" is by no means always so ready as he should be to remember that a story which is characteristic, even if startling, may quite possibly be true, or at least, in the conventional phrase, rest upon a substratum of fact. The undeniable difficulty of determining where precisely that is to be found, and how far it extends, has often led both to a desiccation of history with results quite unhistorical, and to a certain impatience which is a fatal obstacle to understanding. No doubt a preliminary process of analysis and dissection is necessary before the task of reconstruction can be safely undertaken, but the researcher loses something, not merely in artistry but even in the mastery of his own special technique, if he confines himself too exclusively to unmaking. We may venture an example which is hardly likely to cause dispute. Few more stimulating books could be placed in the hands of an able young student than Père Hippolyte Delehaye's *Legends of the Saints*, but the most illustrious of the Bollandists, who is held in honour wherever scholarship is named, would have failed disastrously in achieving his purpose if that little book, devastating as it is in some parts, were regarded as mainly destructive. It provides possible clues to interpretation rather than a framework into which stories must be fitted or a machine by which they may

be scientifically dismembered, and it triumphs by a humanity which does not expect or desire to reduce either the saints or their biographers to the position of robots.

Dom Gougaud also in his *Christianity in Celtic Lands* has applied himself with a patience and resolution which seem almost indomitable to the twofold task of criticism and reconstruction. Those who during the last twenty years have found themselves repeatedly indebted to its predecessor, *Les Chrétientés celtiques*, will extend the warmest of welcomes to the new volume, which has been so largely augmented, besides being in part remodelled, that it must be regarded as an independent work. As a survey of the literature of the subject, including copious references to articles in periodicals, it is indeed so valuable that no possible, and even probable, dissent from some of the author's conclusions ought to deprive it of a place in libraries as the most useful work of reference upon the subject. We may add that it has three maps, an elaborate bibliography, and an index of names.

An admirable example of the process of change that has been going on during the last two decades may be found in the fact that of the first chapter on "The Heathen Celts in the British Isles," and of the section on organization in the fourth ("The Britons in Armorica"), an almost complete recasting has been found necessary. The fifteenth centenary of St. Patrick suggested a natural addition to the second chapter on "The Rise of Christianity in the Insular Countries" in order to deal with his "posthumous fame," and considerable extension has been made under the headings relating to Culture, Theology, Liturgy, and the Arts. Indeed, only the plan of Chapters VI. ("Controversies in Matters of Discipline") and VII. ("The Clergy and Ecclesiastical Institutions") remains unaltered, while in the last chapter ("The Gradual Decline of Celtic Particularism") the writer has made another very interesting addition in a section devoted to "the ecclesiastical reforms in Cornwall between the ninth and the eleventh centuries."

If candour compels the admission that, regarded as a book rather than as a storehouse of information, Dom Gougaud's work is by no means easy to read consecutively, the difficulty must be ascribed to the method of composition, not to the translator's performance of an exacting task. It may seem hard measure to suggest that the footnotes, of which the number already runs into hundreds, ought to have been made to carry a good deal which is now to be found in the text; but even the twenty-five invaluable pages devoted to St. Patrick would have gained in impressiveness had some of the minor points for discussion been dealt with in this way. Of course,

where so much has to be done in the way of dissection, whether of original authorities or of the often perverse theories of scholars, it would be absurd to expect the same liveliness as the writer sometimes allows himself, as, for example, in the chapter on "Intellectual Culture," where he gives in Dr. Robin Flower's wonderful translation the poem of the ninth-century Irish scholar and his cat, to which we may tempt the reader who does not already possess Miss Eleanor Hull's *Poem Book of the Gael* by quoting the first and last stanzas:

I and Pangur Bán, my cat,
'Tis a like task we are at;
Hunting mice is his delight,
Hunting words I sit all night.

Practice every day has made
Pangur perfect in his trade;
I get wisdom day and night,
Turning darkness into light.

This chapter contains a large number of topics, including some already familiar to readers of Professor Raymond Beazley's *Dawn of Modern Geography*, which is one of the few works that the writer seems to have overlooked. In his judgments here and elsewhere Dom Gougaud is perhaps at times unduly severe. St. Patrick's Latin deserves gentler treatment than that of the "Hisperica Famina" by any reasonable canon, but it can scarcely be said to receive it, and we are left in some doubt if the most promising method of approach is being adopted when we read: "The most celebrated Irish virgin whose name history has handed down to us is St. Brigid of Kildare. Unfortunately, the inexact and incoherent character of the biographies of the saint make it hard to find out anything definite about her life." In regard to the question of the influence of Irish practice in regard to confession upon that of the rest of Western Europe, one theory is summarily dismissed without discussion, but the reader will find it by no means easy to discover how, in the writer's view, a survey of all the relevant evidence would work out. Yet the matter is one of real importance and strictly germane to the subject. And is it not, we wonder, being a little too modern to write of St. David that "he founded the See of Mynyw . . . on a rugged promontory overlooking the Irish Sea, in a wild and picturesque situation, better adapted to the contemplative life of monks than to the needs of an episcopal see"? We could wish Dom Gougaud not less than three pilgrimages to St. David's in expiation of that impiety.

However, if the writer sometimes falls himself a victim to the temptation to apply the ideas of the nineteenth or twentieth century to mediæval conditions and circumstances, he can

manage some shrewd blows at others who similarly offend. It is, for example, one of his theses that such a thing as a "Celtic Church" never existed, and for reasons which will readily suggest themselves he prefers the expression "Celtic Churches." He makes equally good play when he says: "Some British writers, anxious at all costs to safeguard the early Celtic Church from Roman influence, have conceived the idea of deriving insular monasticism directly from the East. This is just a particular instance of that Oriental 'mirage' so frequently met with in all branches of historical research." In both cases the warning is as salutary as is another in regard to the spurious letter of Dinoot to Augustine of Canterbury, which "was composed, not by Dinoot in the seventh century, but by a Welsh Protestant of the sixteenth, who placed his own sentiments on the Papacy in the mouth of the Abbot of Bangor. The original text was written in Welsh, and it was translated into Latin by Spelman." But exaggeration on one side may equally suggest a danger of undue minimizing on the other. The question of Eastern influences, like the question of the knowledge of Greek, is one of extreme difficulty, and it may be doubted if either Dom Gougaud or the authorities whom he follows would be satisfied that the last word had been said. Similarly with regard to the relations of the Celtic Churches and the See of Rome the writer, especially in the chapter on "Disciplinary Controversies," weakens the real strength of his own case by substituting general statements of a somewhat rhetorical kind for a detailed discussion of the evidence such as he gives so liberally elsewhere.

CLAUDE JENKINS.

THE STORY OF THE STUDENT CHRISTIAN MOVEMENT. By Tissington Tatlow, M.A., D.D. S.C.M. Press. 12s. 6d.

A day or two after a fresher has first gone up to Girton, an eager-eyed second- or third-year student will burst into her room and exclaim, "Oh, *do* join S.C.M.!" If the fresher is well-advised she will join S.C.M. She will become a member of a Study Circle, she will attend Missionary Breakfasts, she will hear religious lectures and special sermons, she will help entertain foreign students, she will go to a "fruiting dance" to raise money for a "fruiting campaign," where she will help undergraduates play with the small children of women engaged in fruit-picking. On this campaign, or at a conference of S.C.M., or at some mission to factory hands or dockers, the Girtonian may meet another Student Christian—a serious-minded, enthusiastic and idealistic young man, who will make her an

admirable husband; and very happy they will be, either in the Foreign Mission field or at home.

Though S.C.M. played such a part in her life, the Girtonian very likely never troubled to enquire how the movement started, who made it what it was, or even, in any detailed way, what its aims were. The society encouraged an intelligent interest in Christianity and brought her into contact with congenial friends; and that was enough.

But now Dr. Tissington Tatlow has set himself to answer all possible questions that anyone, inside the Movement or outside, could possibly ask as to its Whence, Why, How, When and Whither. This book is, as the foreign students would say, "ze documentation." As such it is, unfortunately, very heavy reading. Dr. Tatlow would evidently like to give us not only the minutes of the last meeting, but the minutes of the first meeting, and of all the intervening meetings as well. It is doubtless necessary that every society should have its Hansard, and that records of activities should be kept; but the author might have spared us some of his lists of names, committees, conferences, speeches, resolutions, amendments, constitutions and procedures, and written a book that conveyed more because it recorded less.

The mass of facts which Dr. Tatlow has gathered together are, nevertheless, we must admit, extremely impressive. The book is a superb record of enthusiasm; and I sometimes think that enthusiasm must be one of the virtues most pleasing in the sight of God. The founders and early members of the Movement had as their watchword, "The evangelization of the world in this generation." Alas! much more watching, many more words and the passing of many generations would seem to be needed before a stubborn world will lend an attentive ear to the good news. But the enthusiasm which chose such a watchword shews no sign of growing cold.

S.C.M. in its early days was a purely missionary movement, calling itself the Student Volunteer Missionary Union, and aiming to recruit missionaries from the universities for already existing missionary societies.

To begin with, the Church of England was suspicious of its interdenominational activities. Then Bishop Creighton was won over, and, incidentally, wrote a letter of approval which for fairness of judgment and breadth of sympathy might be recommended for perusal to other Bishops when they are feeling suspicious of some new thing. Enthusiasm and perseverance gradually convinced other eminent persons that a society which was making the universities centres of spiritual power was very valuable indeed.

If men and women students, not only from all over England, but from all over the world, get together and talk, and listen, and pray, will not racial and social prejudices tend to disappear, and all manner of problems, economic, intellectual, ecclesiastical, social, be faced, with some hope of success? Certainly the leaders of the Student Christian Movement believe so, and feel that when they are organizing conferences and retreats; visiting colleges, art schools or other societies; publishing books to meet the needs of the students' enquiring minds or aspiring souls; raising money to relieve distress in foreign universities, they are bringing the Kingdom of God on earth appreciably nearer. Cynics would say that S.C.M. at least keeps undergraduates out of mischief. Idealists see on the heads of these young men and women the bright tongues of the Pentecostal flames.

ÆLFRIDA TILLYARD.

NOTICES

THEODORE, BISHOP OF WINCHESTER: PASTOR, PROPHET, PILGRIM. By Edward S. Woods, Bishop of Croydon; and Frederick B. Macnutt, Provost and Archdeacon of Leicester. London, S.P.C.K. 7s. 6d.

Often when we open a biography we ask, Was this biography called for? Was this man's influence on public affairs significant enough to be recorded? Or, again, Did he shew a development of character and of power which is worthy of our study?

In this case both questions can be answered in the affirmative, and, moreover, the biographers have dealt adequately with both sides of the Bishop's life. His inner development was worthy of record, and here, as elsewhere, the material supplied by Mrs. Woods is valuable, whether given in her own words or taken from her husband's letters to her. Few would have guessed that the Cambridge undergraduate of 1892, with his pietistic views, would become the Bishop whose thoughts on Reunion placed him among the foremost of its champions.

The memoir does justice to the Bishop's work for Reunion. The index (a good one) gives twenty references to the subject. Joint meetings of clergy and Free Church ministers were held at the Vicarage when Woods was Vicar of Bishop Auckland (1908-1912). But his great opportunity came as Bishop of Peterborough at the Lambeth Conference of 1920, from which the great Lambeth Appeal on Reunion was issued. To the *Church Times* he wrote: "It would be easy to work for a pan-Protestant federation or for an exclusive 'Catholic' Church. . . . But . . . to combine historic order with spiritual liberty—this is the problem, and we dare not shirk it. But first, hard thinking, and then spade work in all the Churches" (p. 150).

After Lambeth, Stockholm. In the autumn of 1920, the Bishops of Durham and Peterborough, with the sanction of the Archbishop of Canterbury, joined by the invitation of the Primate of Sweden, Archbishop Söderblom, in the consecration of two Swedish Bishops. An informing description of the ceremony by Bishop Woods is given on p. 155. The act was of significance, for hitherto the two Churches had strangely stood apart. The mission to Sweden was one more indication of the vast extent of the question of Reunion.

Another of the Bishop's cares was the Labour Movement. In the sermon preached at his Consecration in the autumn of 1916 his brother declared: "In humble yet confident dependence upon God he will know how to sympathize with and to help the best aspirations of Labour." Readers of this memoir will feel that this forecast was amply justified. Throughout his episcopate he kept his finger on the pulse of Labour. On the occasion of the General Strike of 1926 he joined the Bishop of Southwark (Dr. Garbett) in a letter to *The Times*, in which they urged that "there are moments in a nation's life when the sacrifice of strict economic principles to higher considerations of justice, mercy (*sic lege*), and humanity is at once worldly wisdom and spiritual duty" (p. 292).

Other important subjects to which the Bishop's reaction is described include Anglo-Catholicism (p. 189 *f.*), the state of religion in Cambridge, Revision of the Prayer Book (pp. 188 *ff.*, 260 *ff.*), the Mission of Help to India (1922-23), Social Ideals, and (last to be mentioned, but not least) Women's Work (pp. 225, 320). Much light is thrown upon the religious conditions of the last quarter of a century. The story is well told by the ample use of the Bishop's own words in sermons and letters.

The action which earned for him the title of the "Walking Bishop" is described on pp. 80-86. "In the summer months of most years, beginning in 1917, he selected two or three deaneries of literally a rural type, with from twelve to fifteen parishes in each of them. He spent a week in each, walking from village to village, holding services in the church and [in] the open air, meeting the people and staying the night with clergy or their parishioners."

A time-table was printed and circulated beforehand, thus:

TUESDAY, JUNE 25.

7.30 a.m.	Holy Communion.
2.30 p.m.	Arrive at T.
3 p.m.	Service at T.
6 p.m.	Arrive at S.
7.30 p.m.	Service at S.

The memoir is well produced with eight full-page illustrations. Inevitably a few misprints occur. On p. 230, line 4 from the bottom, "progamme" (with one r); on p. 292, line 12 from the bottom, read *mercy* for "money"; in the Index, under "Reunion," strike out "104." One criticism may be allowed: the reader has sometimes to search for the date. A date in the headline of the page would often be a welcome help. We owe many thanks to Mrs. Woods and the editors for giving us so much that is good.

W. EMERY BARNES.

THE INFLUENCE OF PHILOSOPHY ON THE MIND OF TERTULLIAN. By the Rev. Dr. C. De Lisle Shortt. Elliot Stock. 4s. 6d.

There can be no doubt about the importance of Tertullian in the history of Christian thought and the formulation of Christian doctrine. With him the long series of Latin Fathers begins; he is the earliest literary product of Latin Christianity, which had its birthplace in Northern Africa. A study of the influences which shaped his mind cannot fail to be of interest. One set of such influences was legal, but, despite his contempt for all philosophers and philosophy, the contemporary philosophical schools supplied him with almost as many ideas as did the lawyers. It was, however, his misfortune to meet ancient philosophy in a debased form, for of all the schools of ancient thought that of the Stoics, with whom chiefly he came into contact, was the weakest and the least satisfactory, at any rate on the metaphysical side. Great as were the moral achievements of some of its leading exponents, Stoicism, as a whole, in its theories of the Universe represents a remarkable decline from the heights attained by Plato and Aristotle.

In this book Dr. Shortt attempts an analysis of the extent of these philosophical influences on the mind and writings of Tertullian. He brings evidence of the effects of the current stoic "materialism" upon Tertullian's teaching about God and the Divine Nature, about man and his psychology, and about the Universe generally. God and the soul are both "material"; nothing that can be said to exist at all can exist without a "body." Plato and Aristotle are completely misunderstood. It remained for the deeper teachings of the Neo-Platonists, working through the mind of St. Augustine, to deliver Christian speculation from this fundamental and most unsatisfactory materialism.

The subject is a large one and suffers some compression when treated, as here, in 100 pages. Even so, the book might have gained in usefulness for the general reader if a little more space had been given to the situation at large both in contemporary pagan thought and in the Church. There are a few misprints, and the spelling, accents, and breathings of the Greek words quoted require attention.

Dr. Rendel Harris contributes a "Foreword."

W. R. V. BRADE.

TALMUDIC JUDAISM AND CHRISTIANITY. By A. Lukyn Williams, D.D. S.P.C.K. 2s.

There must be many students of the New Testament who, not being versed in the study of Hebrew, have been puzzled and hindered by mysterious references to such things as *Berakoth*, *Shemone Esre*, *Tosephta*, since it has not always been easy to find either an exact definition of such things as these, or information as to where it is to be found. This little book of Dr. Lukyn Williams deserves the gratitude of students, if only because it shews, in a simple but scholarly fashion, the nature of the Talmud, and exemplifies its contents.

But the chief theme of the book is the vexed question as to the usefulness of Talmudic Judaism as evidence for the Rabbinic Judaism of the time of our Lord. The destruction of the Temple cut so completely across the history of Judaism, and compelled Judaism to see life, and to expound for the living of life, from so different an angle, that many scholars

have concluded that the Talmudic literature (which was given form between A.D. 200 and A.D. 500) is useless for the study of Judaism of the first century. Dr. Lukyn Williams, after an interesting examination of such things as Dietary Laws, the Sabbath, Circumcision, Tithe, Sacrifices, Fasting and Festivals, concludes that there is no difference in principle, that in differing in detail Judaism was only being true to itself, and, above all, that Judaism in the first century was a "bright and happy religion, knowing nothing of the burdens which many ignorant writers, heathen and Christian, have attributed to it."

Finally Dr. Lukyn Williams maintains that St. Paul's misery in the body of this death is an experience dating from after his conversion, and that our Lord condemned Judaism because it was superficial, meaning, in his application of the term *ὑποκριτής* to the Pharisees, not hypocrites, but play-actors.

NOEL DAVEY.

LAST ETON FABLES. By Cyril Alington. Longmans. 3s. 6d.

It is Dr. Alington's achievement that he has used to impart instruction a literary form which is generally misused for either satire or deadly didacticism, and has produced a thing of peculiar beauty. His Fables teach lessons which can never come amiss at any age, of man or woman, but they also link these lessons with a humour and a beauty too often regarded as having no connection with virtue. Each Fable ends with a short poem, in most cases original, but they are almost poems themselves. One remembers the former volumes—*Shrewsbury Fables*, *Eton Fables*, *More Eton Fables*—because of one or two fables which stand out from the rest. But with this collection it is difficult to choose—they are all so good. Perhaps the last one—"A Christmas Fable"—commends itself most, but then one promptly remembers "The Saint's Hospital" or "Conversation with the Devil," and continues remembering till one has exhausted the book. Is it insatiable to hope that *Last Eton Fables* will be followed by "First Durham Fables"?

V. I. RUFFER.

A LITTLE BOOK ON GOD'S ACRE. By Thomas Alfred Walker, LL.D. S.P.C.K. 2s.

A learned and very interesting "little book" on churchyards, well calculated to stimulate the interest of clergy and laity alike in the care of holy ground. Dr. Walker displays a wealth of legal and historical knowledge, which raises the hope that he will some day find time to write a larger book on the same subject. We cannot, however, accept his suggestion that the Incumbent should devote his fees for monuments to the improvement of the churchyard; they may, like tithes, be out of keeping with the times, but they are his property and cannot fairly be extinguished without compensation.

J. H. McCUBBIN.

GLORIA. Some Psalm-Visions for the Eucharist. By Stacy Waddy, M.A. S.P.C.K. 4s.

This attractive little book contains the text of twenty-two of the Psalms with illuminating comments for their devotional use in connection with

the Holy Eucharist. Some very appropriate modern paintings are reproduced to enable the imagination to recapture the spirit of the Old Testament worship and its Christian development. Canon Waddy has made a praiseworthy use of his opportunities as Archdeacon of Palestine in familiarizing himself not only with the details, but with the spiritual significance of the sacred rites where the Psalms were first sung. He is supremely right in emphasizing the intense consciousness of God and trust in Him, which were the prime characteristics of Hebrew devotion. The "curse-verses" need not, perhaps, have been omitted; they could be used to shew the terrific dangers through which the Chosen People passed, but only just passed, time and time again. The devotional value of the Psalter cannot be divorced from its intellectual value as a historical record of God's unique self-revelation to man; for this reason, and perhaps for others, expurgation is undesirable in a devotional commentary. On p. 59 it should be made clear that the S. Johnson who wrote *City of God* was not the lexicographer. But there is little to criticize in a book which should be read over and over again, whether by individual worshippers or by groups of devout students. It will help us all to fulfil the command, "Sing ye praises with understanding."

J. H. McCUBBIN.

LEARNING THE BREVIARY. By Father Bernard A. Hausmann, S.J. Washbourne and Bogan. 3s. 6d.

The primary usefulness of this book is for those who are bound to the recitation of the whole Breviary. But those who wish to grasp the structure of the Divine Office in its traditional Western form will find this a very lucid and intelligible exposition of the subject. There will be also a number of priests, whose rule of life binds them to the recitation of one or more of the Lesser Hours, who will profit by a study of this little work. For simplicity and convenience of reference, as well as liturgical accuracy, it could scarcely be excelled. There would be less of the "amateur" about our methods of conducting Divine Service if instruction on the lines of Father Hausmann's book were given in theological colleges.

TREVOR JALLAND.

OXFORD CENTENARY SUPPLEMENTARY MISSAL. Compiled by Clement Humilis. Knott and Son. 7s. 6d.

This curious book provides the Proper of Masses for 39 Beati of the Anglican Communion; its author has chosen the pseudonym Humilis, by which he is already known as the author of some admirable devotional works, but which is not so obviously appropriate here. Since it is desirable that conspicuous sanctity in the Anglican Communion should be recognized, and the official Church will not make a move, it is left to individual priests to take the initiative. Let us hope the book will do good in bringing the matter before the public. More than this we cannot say with sincerity. The use of the technical word "Beati" presupposes that Roman methods are being followed at a respectful distance. But when a candidate for sanctity is accepted for consideration, he becomes "Venerable." Beatification follows as the result of a legal process, in which proof of both miracles and heroic sanctity is demanded. Not till then is even a local cultus allowed. If the publication of this book is intended to press

the claims of certain Anglicans, the utmost that can be asked at this stage is that they should be regarded as Venerable.

A quite extraordinary feature of the book is the inclusion of Cardinal Mercier ("thy blessed servant Désiré Joseph"). Surely there is something ludicrous in an Anglican's beatifying a Roman Catholic. The 39 include names like John Keble, Bishop King, and Father Benson. Less obvious are three successive commemorations on February 28, March 5 and 6—Hurrell Froude, Arthur Tooth, and Bishop Richardson of Zanzibar. A significant remark occurs in the Preface: "It will be noticed that every one of the male *Beati* . . . was a graduate of Oxford or Cambridge." Could there be a more damaging witness to the limitations of Anglicanism?

The commemoration of Blessed John Dykes "and his fifty-five melodious tunes in *Hymns Ancient and Modern*" (a phrase from the description meant to be read to the congregation) will amuse rather than edify those who are familiar with musical controversy. The Offertory is: "Write ye this song, and teach it the children of Israel: put it in their mouths, that this song may be a witness to thee."

The book is very well done along its own lines and carries out its plan with happy selection of suitable passages. But the plan is in our opinion faulty.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. LUKE. Edited by H. K. Luce, M.A.
With Introduction and Notes. Cambridge University Press.
7s. 6d.

A new edition of St. Luke in the Cambridge Greek Testament was long overdue. But a shock is indeed in store for any who were still continuing to use the old. To pass from Farrar to Luce is to pass from the conservative scholarship of the Victorian era to Modernism of a type aggressively hostile to traditional Christianity. Mr. Luce writes clearly. He has all the arts of the trained teacher. He has read widely, but it is significant that his greatest admiration is given to the work of a Jew who rejects Christianity. When, however, he begins his introduction with the words, "Until about a century and a half ago the independence and historical accuracy of the four Gospels was unquestioned," we can only express our amazement that his study of Streeter, if nothing else, had not enlightened him as to the existence of St. Augustine, who was quite aware of many of our modern problems, even if his solutions are not always satisfactory. The general attitude of the editor is that of the Liberal Protestantism of Harnack. He frankly admits that "the use of capital letters in pronouns referring to Jesus may perhaps seem inconsistent with the general theological position which this commentary takes up." These presuppositions are not those which lead to an understanding of St. Luke's Gospel. They cause the author to minimize the arguments for the conservative view. The result is that the commentary will only appear satisfactory to those who are prepared to reject the supernatural and to reduce Christ to the level of a prophet. The treatment compares most unfavourably with that in Mr. Balmforth's commentary in the Clarendon Bible. We confess that we find certain passages hard to reconcile with any form of belief that can truly be called Christian. Meanwhile it is important that orthodox teachers should recognize that boys and girls at school are in danger of using a book which throws doubt on the birth at Bethlehem as well as the empty tomb, in the name of modern scholarship,

and should be prepared to defend the traditional faith of the Church with a better and more modern scholarship.

E. J. BICKNELL.

HISTORY OF THE VULGATE IN ENGLAND FROM ALCUIN TO ROGER BACON.

Being an Inquiry into the Text of some English Manuscripts of the Vulgate Gospels. By H. H. Glunz, Ph.D., Dr.Phil. Cambridge University Press. 18s.

This work by Dr. Hans Glunz, lecturer in the University of Cologne, is the kind of book which the professional student takes in hand with pleasurable anticipation and a reasonable assurance that he is not likely to be disappointed. The classified list of seventy-five Gospel MSS. at the beginning will recall pleasant memories of some of them and inspire confidence that a careful attempt has been made to base conclusions on a thorough examination of the evidence. The description of the difference between the earlier and later history of the Vulgate text is brief but not inadequate, even though the reader may allow himself some hesitation to accept the suggested explanation of the variations introduced by early copyists. The next three chapters on the last currents of the ancient textual tradition on the Continent and in England, the early Scholastic method of Interpretation and its influence on the Vulgate text, and above all the account of Lanfranc's influence and the replacement of the ancient English Types by the Text of the Universal Church, are full of interest. Dr. Glunz, as his preface shews, sees his work and the conclusions to which he is led as a complement to the researches of Dr. Z. N. Brooke in his Birkbeck Lectures on "The English Church and the Papacy from the Conquest to the Reign of John," at least so far as the influence of Lanfranc extended. Whether in the sphere of Canon Law or of Biblical studies, and in particular with regard to the diffusion of a special and, as it could not unnaturally be considered, an improved type of Biblical text, that influence could not fail to be great, "*Lanfranco exemplaria ministrante*." How far it went is a matter to be determined not by preconceptions nor by prejudice, but as the result of sober investigation, and the more technical parts of the discussion will be tested and re-tested with these considerations in mind. The author's own conclusion is, at any rate, that of a man who scorns to play for safety. "The more," he says, "we learn about the ecclesiastical aspects of the Conquest, the more it appears that with the Conquest England surrendered the very last peculiarities of her ancient Church to the standards of the Greater Church." It would take a great deal of evidence to establish a conclusion so sweeping as that, and the critic will probably observe that the ambit within which it is applied is wider than the subject-matter of the investigations of Dr. Brooke and Dr. Glunz himself, even when supplemented by observations of Cardinal Gasquet. The last two chapters are devoted to "Twelfth-Century Hermeneutics and the Scholastic Text of Peter the Lombard," and to the stabilization of the scholastic text in the thirteenth century. Dr. Glunz has a most refreshing keenness to clear everything up, and his observations are nearly always ingenious and often acute. But as one studies page after page of citations of readings it is impossible not to wonder if many of them really support or compel the inference drawn, though it is no doubt fair to rejoin that while individual instances may be questionable the cumulative effect is strong. However, those who feel a little uneasy

as to the justice of the statement that the investigation "sheds an entirely new light on the structure of scholastic thought," and still more as to the view taken of what the scholastic writers considered themselves justified in doing, may none the less delight in the occasionally vivid little bits of description of the men themselves and of scenes in which they took part. The six Appendices include a new collation of the MS. C.C.C.C. 286 of which the collation (by the late Dr. A. W. Streane of C.C.C.C.) in Wordsworth and White's Vulgate is described as "very inaccurate" and a new text of Herbert of Bosham's Prefaces to his revision of the Great Gloss of Peter the Lombard.

CLAUDE JENKINS.

PAGEANT OF LIFE. A Human Drama. By Owen Francis Dudley.
Longmans. 4s. 6d. and 6s.

This story, the fourth of a series entitled "Problems of Human Happiness," is of a young man, Cyril Rodney, who has been brought up in the conventional religion of Anglican Protestantism. After sundry youthful escapades, from which he is rescued by his Roman Catholic guide, philosopher, and friend, Anselm Thornton (the "Masterful Monk" of the other numbers in the series), he takes part in the Great War, and after some harrowing experiences becomes convinced of his need of the Catholic Faith and is baptized into the Roman Communion. The story moves to a terrible and utterly unexpected finale, whose scene is laid in Archangel. Frankly, we regret the sensationalism of the book, which in other respects has a considerable artistic and religious value.

J. H. McCUBBIN.

SAMARITAN ORAL LAW AND ANCIENT TRADITIONS. VOL. I. ESCHATOLOGY.
By Moses Gaster, Ph.D. Search Publishing Company. 12s. 6d.

For a number of years the attention of scholars has been directed to the small, and, unfortunately, dwindling community of the Samaritans still left in Palestine. We may congratulate ourselves that they have found an interpreter in Dr. Gaster, an orthodox Jew who is also a very great scholar and an extremely sympathetic personality. He has known the group of which he tells us for thirty-five years, and no one has done more to introduce them to the Western world.

In the present volume Dr. Gaster deals first with the materials at his disposal, and then with the eschatological doctrines of Samaritan theology. He has himself brought to light several documents which have never been edited, and has shewn clearly that there has been a continuous tradition comparable with that of the better-known orthodox Judaism. The *corpus* of this oral law is a work cited by Dr. Gaster as the *Hilluk* (cp. the ordinary Jewish term *Halakah*), and to the evidence supplied by this book Dr. Gaster gives considerable space. Other writers and sources of information are cited with some fullness, especially the *Yom al-Din*, whose final compilation Dr. Gaster refers to the sixteenth century, and various comments made by Samaritan teachers of different periods on Deuteronomy xxxii. The volume closes with chapters on purification, death, and burial, and on the Taheb—the Samaritan term for the Messiah.

The whole forms a book of great interest and value. While the development of Samaritan thought was quite independent of orthodox Rabbinic tradition, it followed the same course and the two present many

parallels, shewing that the growth of Judaism since the destruction of the second Temple has not been accidental or arbitrary, but has sprung out of the very nature of the ancestral faith.

T. H. ROBINSON.

THE INFLUENCE OF ISLAM. By the Rev. E. J. Bolus. Lincoln Williams. 10s. 6d.

This volume is described in a sub-title as "A study of the effect of Islam upon the psychology and civilization of the races which profess it." The reader, however, will gain the impression that, while this account of the book is to some extent justified, Mr. Bolus has still more clearly expounded the influence of the converted nations on Islam. The book falls into two parts. In the first, comprising Chapters I. to VII., we are offered an outline history of the Moslem world, especially on its religious side, and we are shewn its development in the more important areas. It is here that we realize most strongly the fact that, in spite of the rigidity apparently imposed by the Qur'an, national characteristics have not failed to modify Islam, which is, therefore, a very different thing in Persia from what it is in Arabia or in Egypt or in Northern Africa.

The last five chapters deal with the effect produced by the Mohammedan faith on the life and thought of the peoples who profess it, and discuss Moslem law and sociology, philosophy, mysticism, art and science, ethics and psychology. Detailed discussion of this extremely interesting book is here impossible; suffice it to say that Mr. Bolus brings to his task, not only a thorough acquaintance with Moslem literature, but a wide culture and a sense of humour which make his pages very pleasant reading. His presentation of Islam is that of a convinced and earnest Christian, but it cannot be called unfair; if we feel at any point that Mr. Bolus is a little severe on the Moslem, we must remember that he has spent a good part of his life in close and intimate contact with Islam—and we have not!

T. H. ROBINSON.

ISRAELITISCHE UND ALTORIENTALISCHE WEISHEIT. W. Baumgartner. Tübingen. 1933. Pp. 34. RM. 1.50.

From a very early stage in man's intellectual development, a tendency to generalize experience has manifested itself. Whilst it was in Greece that it first developed into a philosophical quest of the Ultimate, it appeared as early as the third millennium B.C. in that effort to discover principles of life and experience which results in a "proverbial philosophy." India, China, the Semitic world, and Egypt—all had their gnomic literature, and Professor Baumgartner's essay places the Israelite Wisdom literature in its due setting. We see how the Hebrew sage owed a debt ultimately to Egypt, to the Aramæan world, and to Mesopotamia, though a direct literary connection is traceable only with Egypt.

Due allowance is made for the possibility that a proverbial literature might arise independently in different communities, and the peculiarities of the Israelite type are clearly sketched. The whole is an extremely well-balanced summary of the subject, and the careful documentation (though we miss a reference to Ranston's work on Ecclesiastes) makes it possible for the reader to go further into the subject.

T. H. ROBINSON.